About UBC

The University of British Columbia is a global centre for research and teaching, consistently ranked among the 40 best universities in the world. Since 1915, UBC’s West Coast spirit has embraced innovation and challenged the status quo. Its entrepreneurial perspective encourages students, staff and faculty to challenge convention, lead discovery and explore new ways of learning. At UBC, bold thinking is given a place to develop into ideas that can change the world.

UBC employs 5,003 faculty members and 9,550 staff members at its Vancouver campus, and 471 faculty members and 673 staff members at its Okanagan campus.

UBC Vancouver Campus is located on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Musqueam First Nation. UBC Okanagan Campus is located on the traditional territory of the Okanagan Nation.
We envision a community in which human rights are respected and equity is embedded in all areas of academic, work and campus life.

Through its leadership, vision and collaborative action, the Equity and Inclusion Office continues to further UBC’s commitment to excellence, equity and mutual respect.
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**About This Report**

UBC is committed to improving employment equity, protecting the human rights of students, faculty and staff across its campuses and work sites, and building a community where principles of inclusion are embedded across academic, work and campus life.

Overall, these efforts are integral to advancing UBC’s commitment to excellence and providing a respectful living, working, and learning environment.

This Employment Equity Report constitutes UBC’s commitment to compliance with the Federal Contractors Program (FCP), which requires that employers of a certain size must develop an employment equity plan in order to receive Federal government funding.

This report provides tables showing the headcount and percentage of employees in each Occupational Group and Designated Group.

“Occupational Group” refers to Employment Equity Occupational Group, which combines jobs that are similar in level or type of work. “Designated Group” includes the four groups designated by legislation - Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities - as well as a fifth category that UBC has chosen to designate, Sexual/Gender Diversity.

UBC’s internal data is compared to the year prior as well as external Census-Canada data, the latter of which is labelled “Comparison to Census.”

**U Count at UBC**

The Equity & Inclusion Office tracks and reports on headcount and proportion of employees in each Occupational Group and Designated Group. The following is an overview of employees by Designated Group.

“Designated Group” includes the four groups designated by legislation - Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities - as well as a fifth category that UBC has chosen to designate, Sexual/Gender Diversity.

UBC’s internal data is compared to the prior year as well as to external Census-Canada data.
Executive Summary

UBC Vancouver Campus

For the Vancouver Campus, the percentage of Women is above the Census Canada comparison group for more than half of the Occupational Groups. The percentage representation is at least 10 per cent higher than the Census Canada comparison for five Occupational Groups.

The percentage of employees who self-identified as Aboriginal Peoples in UBC’s Equity Census is 2.1 per cent overall, equal to the Census Canada representation for the Vancouver workforce, but below the national comparator.

For the Vancouver Campus, the percentage of people self-identifying in the survey as Visible Minorities, 34.6 per cent overall, is at a level below Census representation in Vancouver but above the national workforce.

The representation of Persons with Disabilities remains below the external labour market, where the provincial workforce reports 5.8 per cent of the population being Persons with Disabilities, and by comparison UBC Vancouver Campus has 3.8 per cent representation amongst faculty and staff.

In addition, 7.2 per cent of staff and faculty identified as having a diverse sexual or gender identity, an increase from the year prior.

UBC Vancouver Campus hires Women at a higher rate than the external market. UBC has seen a decline in the hiring of those who self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples and their representation amongst new hires is below the regional and national workforce.

The representation of Visible Minorities amongst new hires remains below that of the labour market data for Vancouver. Similarly, the UBC Vancouver Campus is less successful at hiring those who self-identify as a Persons with Disabilities, neither equalling UBC’s current representation nor the external labour market data.

However, the current proportion of hires of those with diverse sexual or gender identities is higher than the year prior, and is also above that of the pre-existing representation at the Vancouver Campus.

UBC Okanagan Campus

In six out of eight Occupational Groups, Women employees exceed their representation in the Census Canada data. The percentage of employees who self-identified as Aboriginal Peoples is 2.9 per cent overall, which is below the Census Canada average of 4.3 per cent for Kelowna and 3.5 per cent nationwide.

The percentage of people self-identifying as Visible Minorities is higher than the Census Canada comparison group for six of the eight Occupational Groups. Those self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities is lower than the national workforce average as well as the provincial workforce average.

The representation of people who self-identify within the Sexual/Gender Diversity group has increased from 4.6 per cent in 2015 to 5.7 per cent in 2016.

Amongst new hires, the UBC Okanagan Campus hires Women at a higher rate than the Census Canada external market comparison group.

Aboriginal Peoples are hired at a percentage that is higher than their pre-existing representation, and above the Census Canada comparison group for Kelowna and Canada.

Visible Minorities are hired at a higher rate than the pre-existing representation and the regional workforce comparison group, but below the national workforce comparison group.

Hires of those self-identifying on the survey as Persons with Disabilities is at a percentage rate that is lower than pre-existing representation, and also below the provincial and national labour market comparison group.

In addition, the percentage of new hires self-identifying within the Sexual/Gender Diversity category is below the percentage of pre-existing representation on the Okanagan Campus.
Employment Equity Survey Results 2016

**UBC Vancouver Campus**

- **WOMEN**
  - 56.3%
  - -0.1% relative to 2015*
  - +8.1% relative to national workforce**
  - +7.7% relative to Vancouver workforce**

- **VISIBLE MINORITIES**
  - 34.6%
  - -0.3% relative to 2015*
  - +16.8% relative to national workforce**
  - -7.2% relative to Vancouver workforce**

- **PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**
  - 3.8%
  - -0.8% relative to 2015*
  - -1.1% relative to national workforce**
  - -2% relative to provincial workforce**

- **ABORIGINAL**
  - 2.1%
  - +0.2% relative to 2015*
  - -1.4% relative to national workforce**
  - On par with Vancouver workforce

---

* Relative to 2015 UBC Employment Equity Survey data.
** Relative to the 2011 Canada Census data.
*** We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data.
Employment Equity Survey Results 2016
UBC Okanagan Campus

**WOMEN**
- 1.3% relative to 2015*
- +8.4% relative to national workforce**
- +7.5% relative to Kelowna workforce**
- 56.6%

**VISIBLE MINORITIES**
- 0.5% relative to 2015*
- -6.3% relative to national workforce**
- +5.3% relative to Kelowna workforce**
- 11.5%

**SEXUAL & GENDER DIVERSITY**
- +1.1% relative to 2015
- 5.7%

**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**
- -0.6% relative to 2015*
- -0.2% relative to national workforce**
- -1.1% relative to provincial workforce**
- 4.7%

**ABORIGINAL**
- -0.1% relative to 2015*
- -0.6% relative to national workforce**
- -1.4% relative to Kelowna workforce**
- 2.9%

* Relative to 2015 UBC Employment Equity Survey data.
** Relative to the 2011 Canada Census data.
*** We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data.
Introduction

UBC is committed to improving employment equity and protecting the human rights of students, faculty and staff across its campuses and work sites. These areas of focus are integrated into the University’s broader commitment to excellence and mutual respect. Equity and human rights are foundational to UBC’s academic pursuits, our working lives, and our involvement in the larger campus community.

In order to pursue excellence in research, innovation, and student success, UBC must foster opportunity for a diverse workforce. UBC aspires to exceed minimal expectations required by employment equity legislation. Put simply, understanding and implementing employment equity helps achieve inclusion and fairness, brings a rich diversity to UBC as a workplace, and creates the necessary conditions for innovation and excellence.

Amongst UBC’s key accountability efforts is this annual Employment Equity Report, where the representation of the designated groups amongst different Occupational Groups for faculty and staff have been tracked and are reported.

Federal Employment Equity legislation has designated four equity groups: Women, Aboriginal Peoples, Visible Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities. In addition, UBC has chosen to designate Sexual and Gender Diversity as a fifth designated group. “Occupational Group” refers to Employment Equity Occupational Group (EEOG), a grouping of all faculty and staff into 15 categories based on National Occupational Codes. UBC’s internal data is compared to the external Census Canada data, which is itself labelled “Comparison to Census.”

This information is collected through the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire that, upon hire, asks people to self-identify if they are a member of the four designated groups or as having a diverse sexual or gender identity. In addition, for the purpose of calculating the representation of Women, we use information on an employee’s sex which is pre-existing in our Human Resource Management System (HRMS). Cross-sectional analysis of the combined Employment Equity Census and HRMS data is provided by Occupational Group, designated group, campus (Vancouver or Okanagan), and bargaining unit, in order to identify areas where UBC’s representation is higher than, or lower than, the Canadian Census population. UBC also tracks hiring trends, and collects and reports information on supplemental categories such as ethnicity and type of disability.

This report also constitutes UBC’s commitment to compliance with the Federal Contractors Program that requires employers of a certain size to survey their employees and develop an equity plan, in order to receive federal contracts and funding.

As UBC receives significant funding from the Government of Canada, UBC is committed to compliance at the very least, and will continue to pursue equity goals that are above and beyond those required by the legislation.

Regarding the level of participation in UBC’s Employment Equity Census (also known as the “return rate”), it should be noted that the 2016 questionnaire had a much higher participation rate than the year prior (Graph 1, below). For the Vancouver Campus, participation increased from 56.3% in 2015 to 72.2% in 2016. For the Okanagan Campus, participation increased from 68.7% in 2015 to 80.0% in 2016. For more information, detailed tables regarding the return rate are provided in Appendix B.

The re-survey by the Equity & Inclusion Office of UBC’s workforce population has contributed to these improved return rates. The survey was conducted electronically beginning May 2016, and an additional re-survey via paper copy was conducted in the fall of 2016 targeting employees who do not work at a computer workstation. Completion of the survey is now mandatory for new hires, although employees have the option to decline to answer.
Graph 1: Return Rate of Employment Equity Census Questionnaire at UBC, 2009-2016
Employment Equity Occupational Groups at UBC

All positions at UBC are classified using the fifteen Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs) established by the Federal Government. Table 1 lists these groups, examples of UBC positions in each category, and the geographic area from which UBC would normally recruit staff. Please note that some of the groups do not apply to the Okanagan Campus.
Table 1: Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Examples of UBC Positions</th>
<th>Area of Recruitment ¹ ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Dean, Deputy Vice Chancellor, President, Registrar, University Librarian, Vice President.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Chair, Computer Systems Manager, Director, Financial Manager, Food Service Manager, Head.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professors</td>
<td>Adjunct Professors, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Clinical Professor or Instructor, Lecturer, Member Extra Sessional Studies, Professor, Senior Instructor, Sessionals.</td>
<td>National ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (excluding University Professors)</td>
<td>Accountant, Coordinator Student Services, Counselor, Editor, Employee Relations Officer, General Librarian, Genetic Assistant, Physician, Programmer/Analyst, Scientific Engineer, Social Science Researcher.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>Biosafety Officer, Building Inspector, Coach, Engineering Technician, Graphics Supervisor, Horticulturist, Library Assistant, Medical Artist, Research Assistant/Technician, Research Scientist.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Accommodation Manager, Accounting Supervisor, Campus Mail Supervisor, Cleaning Supervisor, Head Service Worker, Section Head, Senior Resident Attendant, Supervisor (Administration), Word Processing Coordinator.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>Farm Manager, Grounds Supervisor, Head Carpenter, Head Plumber, Herd Manager, Mechanical Trades Supervisor, Sub-Head Electrician, Sub-Head Gardener.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Senior Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant, Administrator, Budget Analyst, Conference Coordinator, Lab Supervisor, Office Manager, Personnel Assistant, Secretary 1-5, Senior Admissions Officer, Executive Assistant.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Sales &amp; Service Personnel</td>
<td>Assistant Cook, Commissary Cook, Commissary Baker, First Cook, Head Cook, Relief Cook.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades Workers</td>
<td>Bricklayer, Carpenter, Electrician, Locksmith, Maintenance Engineer I and II, Painter, Plumber, Sheet Metal Worker, Shift Engineer.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>Administrative Clerk, Buyer 1 to 3, Clerk 1 to 3, Clinical Office Assistant 1 to 3, Computer Operator, Data Entry Clerk, General Clerk, Mail Clerk, Program Assistant, Store Person.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>Bookstore Assistant, Computer Salesperson, Dental Assistant, Housekeeper, Patrol Person, Sales Attendant, Sales Clerk, Utility Worker, Waiter/Waitress.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>Clerk Driver, Farm Worker 1 to 5, Milker, Nursery &amp; Greenhouse Gardener, Printing Operator 2 and 3, Spray Painter, Truck Driver.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sales &amp; Service Personnel</td>
<td>Food Services Assistant, Gate Keeper, General Worker, Grocery Clerk, Janitor, Caretaker, Building Supplies Service Worker, Kiosk Attendant, Residence Attendant, Service Worker: Ice Maker.</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>Labourer 2, Labourer 2 (Construction &amp; Heavy), Labourer 3 (Special).</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Area of Recruitment: National = “Canada” for both Campuses. Municipal = “Vancouver” for Vancouver Campus and “Kelowna” for the Okanagan Campus. Where noted, the comparison may be changed to province-wide data based on data availability.

² Because this report makes comparisons to Census Canada data, the broadest available geographic category for labour market comparison is national. Comparisons to the international labour market may be appropriate for University Professors, however that comparison is outside of the scope of this report.
Representation of Designated Groups amongst Staff and Faculty
Tables 2-6 provide information on the representation of designated groups amongst faculty and staff at the UBC Vancouver Campus. The data is presented for each designated group in a separate table, and includes both 2015 and 2016 data. Hiring trend data is provided in Table 7 with additional analysis of the dynamic between UBC’s hiring and pre-existing representation of designated groups. These tables are created as described in the Methodology Notes in Appendix D of this Report.

This information is collected through the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire that, upon hire, asks people to self-identify if they are a member of the four designated groups or as having a diverse sexual or gender identity.
Women

As shown in Table 2, Women at the UBC Vancouver Campus are represented at a percentage rate which is higher than the Canada Census comparison group for more than half of Occupational Groups (EEOG), including such levels as Senior Managers, Middle & Other Managers, Professionals, Semi-Professionals & Technicians, Supervisors, Administrative & Senior Clerical, Clerical Personnel, and Intermediate Sales & Service.

The percentage representation is at least ten percent higher than the Census Canada comparison for Senior Managers, Middle & Other Managers, Professionals, Semi-Professionals & Technicians, and Supervisors.

Women are represented at a rate which is below the Census Canada comparison in such areas as University Professors, Supervisors: Crafts & Trades, Skilled Sales & Service, Skilled Crafts & Trades, Semi-Skilled Manual Workers, Other Sales & Service, and Other Manual Workers.

For women at the Vancouver Campus, there are four occupational groups where representation is above the comparison group and still increasing, four occupational groups where representation has declined yet is still above the comparison group, and four occupational groups where our representation is below the comparison group yet is increasing year-over-year. There is one occupational group where UBC has below-comparison representation and is also declining.

Table 2 Representation of Women at the UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Women, Respondents to UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 # Women</td>
<td># Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,112</td>
<td>5,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 48.2%
Vancouver Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 48.6%

n.a. = not applicable or not available
Aboriginal Peoples

As shown in Table 3, the percentage of employees who self-identified as Aboriginal Peoples in UBC’s Equity Census is 2.1% overall. UBC’s representation of 2.1% is at the same level as that of the Census Canada representation for the Vancouver workforce population, but below the national workforce population, which is 3.5%.

Aboriginal Peoples on the Vancouver Campus have representation in ten occupational groups that is higher than the census comparison group. There are two occupational groups where there is no representation. However, the overall representation of Aboriginal Peoples increased from 1.9% in 2015 to 2.1% in 2016. In this case, we caution that the data is sensitive to small sample size.

Table 3 Representation of Aboriginal Peoples at the UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples, Respondents to UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>2015 #</th>
<th>2016 #</th>
<th>2015 %</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. = not applicable or not available
Visible Minorities

The percentage of people self-identifying as Visible Minorities in UBC’s Equity Census (Table 4) is at a level above their representation in the broader Canadian workforce, yet below that of the Vancouver workforce. The percent self-identifying as Visible Minorities in UBC’s Equity Census has a slight increase from 34.3% in 2015 to 34.6% in 2016, and nine of the fifteen Occupational Groups declined slightly from the year prior.

Looking at the breakdown by Occupational Group, people self-identifying as Visible Minorities in UBC’s Equity Census remain at, or above, the percentage representation in the Canadian Census population for eight of fifteen groups. Occupational Groups where Visible Minorities are self-reporting at a rate below the comparison group include Senior Managers, Middle & Other Managers, University Professors, Professionals, Supervisors: Crafts & Trades, Semi-Skilled Manual Workers, and Other Manual Workers.

Table 4: Representation of Visible Minorities at the UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Visible Minorities, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 #</td>
<td>2016 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>3,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)**
17.8%

**Vancouver Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)**
41.8%

n.a. = not applicable or not available
Persons with Disabilities

Based on self-identification in UBC’s Equity Census, Persons with Disabilities (Table 5) are represented across almost all Occupational Groups at UBC’s Vancouver Campus with the exception of Senior Managers. However, the representation of Persons with Disabilities remains below the provincial workforce average of 5.8% as well as the national workforce average of 4.9%.

In this particular case, we caution that the data is sensitive to small sample size. There were 290 Persons with Disabilities self-identifying in our survey in 2015, and in 329 such Persons in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 4.9%

Vancouver Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 5.8%

Footnotes:
a = For Comparison to Census data, combines Senior Managers with Middle & Other Managers.
b = According to Statistics Canada, this figure should be used with caution due to small sample size.
c = For these Occupational Groups, due to small sample size for the level-specific Census Canada data, we provide the representation of Persons with Disability for all Occupational Groups province-wide.
d = Occupational Group numbers 4 to 15 are compared to the entire provincial labour market, due to the absence of city-specific data for this data source.
n.a. = not applicable or not available.
Sexual & Gender Diversity

People who self-identify within the Sexual/Gender Diversity group represent 7.2% of faculty and staff on the Vancouver Campus (Table 6).

Persons from this broadly-defined Sexual/Gender Diversity community are represented in most Occupational Groups, with the exception of Supervisors: Crafts & Trades and Semi-Skilled Manual Workers. Otherwise, representation is between 1.8% and 16.2%. The highest representation is amongst Senior Managers and Skilled Sales & Service workers. The proportion of Sexual/Gender Diversity changed from 6.0% in 2015 to 7.2% in 2016, while the total headcount almost doubled from 376 to 627 persons.

Within this larger 7.2% of the workforce, 6.3% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or an analogous term. An additional 0.8% of respondents self-identify as trans, transgender, gender-fluid, or an analogous term. These two categories have been combined in order to ensure greater confidentiality because of the small population size. Please also note that for this group, external labour market comparisons are not available.

Table 6 Representation of Sexual/Gender Diversity at the UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Sexual/Gender Diversity*, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
- n.a. = not applicable or not available.
- * = The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transfeminine, intersex, asexual +, or other analogous term. We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data.
New Hires

In this section, hiring rates (Table 7) are compared to the Canada Census pre-existing representation of staff and faculty by designated group. New hire data is based on those new hires self-identifying as members of a particular designated group on UBC's Equity Census Questionnaire, with the exception of data on Women which uses pre-existing employee records from our HRMS.

For Women, the UBC Vancouver Campus hires at a higher rate than the external market; 58.6% of new staff and faculty are Women, compared to 48.2% of Canadian workers and 48.6% of Vancouver workers.

UBC hires people who self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples at a percentage rate that is lower than the external markets; 1.7% of new faculty and staff self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples compared to the Vancouver workforce population and national workforce population, which is 2.1% and 3.5%, respectively. Vancouver is UBC’s target recruiting market for most Occupational Groups (i.e. excluding Senior Managers which is a national labour market, and University Professors, which are compared to the national labour market for this report but might normally be regarded as an international labour market). UBC’s estimated representation of Aboriginal Peoples amongst new hires is higher than the Census Canada benchmark for such levels as University Professors, Professionals, and Skilled Sales & Service. In this case, small sample size is a factor, as the high and low representation often reflects a difference between zero and five people.

UBC hires people who self-identify in the questionnaire as Visible Minorities at a lower rate (31.9% overall) than the pre-existing representation (34.6% overall) and below the Vancouver labour market (41.8% overall).

For University Professors, the results are more nuanced; 18.8% of UBC’s current faculty and 23.2% of new hires self-identify as a Visible Minority in the Equity Census Questionnaire, which in both cases exceeds the Canadian Census national labour market comparison of 17.8%. While this report compares UBC’s representation to the Canadian Census, for which the broadest possible comparison group is national, many faculty are recruited internationally.

UBC recruits people who self-identify as Persons with Disabilities in the questionnaire at a rate that is lower (at 1.7%) than UBC’s pre-existing representation (at 3.8%), which is itself lower than the provincial comparison of 5.8%.

For the Sexual/Gender Diversity community, UBC Vancouver Campus recruits new staff who self-identify as such at a rate of 10.8%, which is higher than the pre-existing population of 7.2%.
### Table 7 New Hires by Occupational Group and Designated Group at the UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples</th>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>Sexual /Gender Diversity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Comparison to Census</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Workforce Population (All Groups)**

- **Gender**: 48.2%
- **Aboriginal Peoples**: 3.5%
- **Visible Minorities**: 17.8%
- **Persons with Disabilities**: 4.9%

**Regional Workforce Population (All Groups)**

- **Gender**: 48.6%
- **Aboriginal Peoples**: 2.1%
- **Visible Minorities**: 41.8%
- **Persons with Disabilities**: 5.8%

---

**Footnotes:**
- a = For Comparison to Census data, the data combines Senior Managers with Middle & Other Managers.
- b = According to Statistics Canada, this figure should be used with caution due to small sample size.
- c = For these Occupational Groups, due to small sample size for the level-specific Census Canada data, we provide the representation of Persons with Disability for all Occupational Groups province-wide.
- d = For Persons with Disabilities, Occupational Group numbers 4 to 15 are compared to the entire provincial labour market, due to the absence of city-specific data for this data source. For Gender, Aboriginal Peoples, and Visible Minorities, the data comparison is municipal data.
- e = The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transgender, intersex, asexual *, or other analogous term. We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data.
- n.a. = not applicable or not available.  x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.
Tables 8-12 provide information on the representation of designated groups amongst UBC Okanagan Campus faculty and staff. The data is presented for each designated group in a separate table, and includes both 2015 and 2016 data.

Hiring trend data is provided in Table 13 with additional discussion of the dynamic between UBC’s hiring and pre-existing representation of designated groups. These tables are created based on the methodology described in the Methodology Notes in Appendix D of this Report.
Women

As shown in Table 8, Women are represented at a percentage rate that is above the Census Canada comparison for six Occupational Groups (EEOG), including such levels as Senior Managers, Middle & Other Managers, University Professors, Professionals, Semi-Professionals & Technicians, and Administrative & Senior Clerical. The percentage representation is at least ten percent higher than the Census Canada comparison for Middle & Other Managers, Professionals, as well as Semi-Professionals & Technicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Women, Respondents to UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Women</td>
<td># Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 48.2%

Kelowna Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 49.1%

Footnotes:

n.a. = not applicable or not available.  x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.

Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Group (EEOG) numbers 7, 9, 12, 13 and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.
**Aboriginal Peoples**

In Table 9, the number of employees who self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples is 2.9% overall, and is below the Kelowna and national averages of 4.3% and 3.5%, respectively. The percentage has slightly decreased while the number self-identifying has increased by 5 people from the year prior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples, Respondents to UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>2015 #</th>
<th>2016 #</th>
<th>2015 %</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)**: 3.5%

**Kelowna Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups)**: 4.3%

Footnotes:
- n.a. = not applicable or not available.
- Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Group (EEOG) numbers 7, 9, 12, 13 and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.
- x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.
Visible Minorities

The percentage of people self-identifying as Visible Minorities (Table 10) is higher than the Census Canada comparison group for six of the eight Occupational Groups. However, the percentage decreased from the year prior in seven cases.

Table 10: Representation of Visible Minorities at the UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Visible Minorities, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 #</td>
<td>2016 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 17.8%

Kelowna Workforce Population (All Occupational Groups) 6.2%

Footnotes:
- n.a. = not applicable or not available.
- Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Groups (EEOG) number 7, 9, 12, 13, and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.
- x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.
Persons with Disabilities

Those self-identifying in the questionnaire as Persons with Disabilities (Table 11) have a level of representation at 4.7%, which is below the national workforce and provincial workforce average of 4.9% and 5.8%, respectively. The percent representation is below UBC’s comparison market in most Occupational Groups with the exception of University Professors, Semi-Professionals & Technicians, and Administrative & Senior Clerical.

Table 11 Representation of Persons with Disabilities at the UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
<th>Canada Census Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 #</td>
<td>2016 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

a = For Comparison to Census data, the data combines Senior Managers with Middle & Other Managers.
b = According to Statistics Canada, this figure should be used with caution due to small sample size.
c = For these Occupational Groups, due to small sample size for the level-specific Census Canada data, we provide the representation of Persons with Disability for all Occupational Groups province-wide.
d = Occupational Groups number 4 to 15 are compared to the entire provincial labour market, due to the absence of city-specific data for this data source.
Please note that UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Groups (EEOG) number 7, 9, 12, 13, and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.
x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.
Sexual/Gender Diversity

People who self-identify within the Sexual/Gender Diversity group represent 5.7% of faculty and staff completing the Equity Census (Table 12). This percentage reflects an increase of 17 people or 1.1% of all survey respondents.

Persons from this broadly-defined Sexual/Gender Diversity category are found to have a higher representation amongst Middle & Other Managers and University Professors. Due to a lack of data, we cannot interpret whether Sexual/Gender Diversity is representative of the local workforce. Within the larger 5.7% of the workplace, 5.3% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or an analogous term. An additional 0.4% of respondents self-identify as trans, transgender, gender-fluid, or an analogous term. These two categories have been combined to ensure greater confidentiality because of the small population size. Please also note that for this group, external labour market comparisons are not available.

Table 6 Representation of Sexual/Gender Diversity at the UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Sexual/Gender Diversity*, Respondents to the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Senior Managers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 University Professors</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professionals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervisors</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

n.a. = not applicable or not available.

x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.

Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Groups (EEOG) number 7, 9, 12, 13, and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.

a = The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transgender, intersex, asexual +, or other analogous term. We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data.
New Hires

In this section, UBC’s hiring rates (Table 13) are reviewed in comparison to the Census Canada pre-existing representation of staff and faculty by designated group, for the Okanagan Campus.

For Women, UBC hires at a higher rate than the external market; 58.1% of UBC’s new staff and faculty are Women, compared to 48.2% of Canadian workers and 49.1% of Kelowna workers being Women.

For those self-identifying as Aboriginal Peoples, UBC hires at a higher rate than the external markets; 4.8% of new staff and faculty self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples compared to 3.5% of the national workforce and 4.3% of the Kelowna workforce. The percentage representation of Aboriginal Peoples amongst new hires is higher than the Census Canada comparison group for University Professors, Professionals, and Semi-Professionals & Technicians.

UBC hires people who self-identify as Visible Minorities, at a higher rate (14.5% overall) than the pre-existing representation (11.5% overall) and above the Kelowna workforce average of 6.2%, but below the national workforce average of 17.8%.

For Persons with Disabilities, UBC recruits people who self-identify as such in the questionnaire at a lower level (1.6% overall) than pre-existing representation (at 4.7% overall), which is itself lower than the provincial comparison group of 5.8%.

For Sexual/Gender Diversity, UBC recruits at a lower level (1.6%) than the pre-existing representation (at 5.7%), according to self-identification in the questionnaire.
### Table 7: New Hires by Occupational Group and Designated Group at the UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples</th>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>Sexual /Gender Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisors: Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>58.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Workforce Population (All Groups)**

|                       | 48.2% | 3.5% | 17.8% | 4.9% |

**Regional Workforce Population (All Groups)**

|                       | 49.1% | 4.3% | 6.2%  | 5.8% |

**Footnotes:**

- **a**: For Comparison to Census data, the data combines Senior Managers with Middle & Other Managers.
- **b**: According to Statistics Canada, this figure should be used with caution due to small sample size.
- **c**: For these Occupational Groups, due to small sample size for the level-specific Census Canada data, we provide the representation of Persons with Disability for all Occupational Groups province-wide.
- **d**: For Persons with Disabilities, Occupational Group numbers 4 to 15 are compared to the entire provincial labour market, due to the absence of city-specific data for this data source. For Gender, Aboriginal Peoples, and Visible Minorities, the comparison is municipal data.
- **e**: The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transsexual, intersex, asexual +, or other analogous term. We have omitted the comparison to Canadian Census due to limited external data. While 1 (1.6%) of the respondents self-identified as a person who is lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or an analogous term, no one (0.0%) self-identified as a person who is transgender or an analogous term.
- **n.a.**: not applicable or not available. **x**: data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.
Supplementary Survey Questions

The UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire includes supplementary questions that are not requirements of the Federal Contractors Program. UBC asks for additional information on race/ethnicity and for details regarding Persons with Disabilities. These tables are created based on a methodology described in the Methodology Notes in Appendix D of this Report. Staff and faculty may decline to answer any or all of the supplementary questions, and all responses are confidential. The response rate for the supplementary questions tends to be lower than that of the designated groups.
Representation by Race/ Ethnicity

Vancouver Campus

55.9% of those who completed the additional questions on race/ethnicity identified themselves as White. A further 15.9% identified as Chinese, 5.4% identified as Filipino, and 4.3% identified as South Asian. It should be noted that the re-survey of the workforce population resulted in a 2,460-person increase in those completing the supplemental questionnaire. Due to this shift we advise caution on the interpretation of year-over-year trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>4,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Representation by Race/Ethnicity, UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

Okanagan Campus

80.1% of those who complete the additional questions on race/ethnicity identified themselves as White. A further 2.8% identified as Aboriginal Peoples or Chinese, 1.4% identified as South Asian, and 1.3% identified as West Asian. Because of increased responses due to the re-survey of the workforce population, interpretations of year-over-year shifts should be made with caution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Representation by Race/Ethnicity, UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

*Total Respondents is the total number of faculty and staff completing the supplemental questionnaire. This number will be larger than the sum of the numbers above, as some respondents did not respond to this section of the supplemental questionnaire.
Representation of Persons with Disabilities by Type of Disability

Vancouver Campus

Of those on the Vancouver Campus self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities (Table 16) and providing additional information on their disability type, 2.1% indicated that they had a physical disability or impairment, 3.5% indicated they had an invisible disability or impairment, 6.1% indicated that they had an ongoing medical condition, and 35% of those with a disability indicated that their disability requires some kind of workplace accommodation. A year-over-year comparison is not viable because the total number of survey respondents has increased due to the re-survey of the workforce population trends.

Table 16 Representation of Persons with Disabilities by Type of Disability, UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff, Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff, Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability or Impairment</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible Disability or Impairment</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Medical Condition</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Your Disability Require Workplace</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation?**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people who answered &quot;yes&quot; at least one (questions 1, 2 or 3)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents**</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>6,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage is out of those who answered “Yes” at least once (questions 1, 2 or 3).
** Total respondents is the total number of faculty and staff completing the supplemental questionnaire. This number will be larger than the sum of the numbers above, as some respondents did not respond to this section of the supplemental questionnaire.

Okanagan Campus

Of those on the Okanagan Campus self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities (Table 17) and providing additional information on their disability type, 2.4% indicated that they had a physical disability or impairment, 3.8% indicated they had an invisible disability or impairment, 6.6% indicated that they had an ongoing medical condition, and 43% of those with a disability indicated that their disability requires some kind of workplace accommodation. Year-over-year comparisons should be made with caution, as the total number of respondents to the supplemental questionnaire increased due to the re-survey of the workforce population.

Table 17 Representation of Persons with Disabilities by Type of Disability, UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff, Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff, Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability or Impairment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible Disability or Impairment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Medical Condition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Your Disability Require Workplace</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation?**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people who answered &quot;yes&quot; at least one (questions 1, 2 or 3)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents**</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representation of Designated Groups by Bargaining Unit

Tables 18 and 19 show the representation by the designated groups according to bargaining unit, plus several non-unionized employee groups. These tables are created as described in the Methodology Notes in Appendix D of this Report. The acronyms for each bargaining unit are as follows:

Glossary of Bargaining Unit Acronyms

**AAPS** - Association of Administrative and Professional Staff, representing managers and professionals that are excluded from other bargaining units.

**BCGEU** - British Columbia Government Employees’ Union (including Vancouver local of childcare employees and a support-staff local on the Okanagan Campus).

**CUPE** - Canadian Union of Public Employees, including local 116 representing trades, research technicians, and other support staff; local 2950 representing library support, administrative support, and other support staff; and local 2278 representing English Language Instructors who are also referred to as Non-Credit Instructors. CUPE 2278 members who are student employees delivering teaching assistance, are outside the scope of this Report.

**IUOE** - International Union of Operating Engineers, a union representing operating engineers.

**IUOE** - International Union of Operating Engineers, a union representing operating engineers.

**Vancouver Campus**

Women are represented at UBC’s Vancouver Campus (Table 18) at a rate of 56.2% of staff and faculty. Representation amongst Women is above 56.2% for such bargaining units as BCGEU (Vancouver Child Care), CUPE 2278 (Non-Credit Instructors / English Language Institute), CUPE 2950, Excluded M&P, Exec Admin, AAPS, and Technicians & Research Assistants (Non-Union Techs).

For faculty and staff 2.1% self-identify in UBC’s survey as Aboriginal Peoples, and representation is above 2.1% in such groups as BCGEU (Vancouver Child Care), CUPE 116, CUPE 2950, IUOE 882, AAPS, and Senior Executives.

Those self-identifying as Visible Minorities make up 34.6% of those who complete the questionnaire, and are more highly represented amongst BCGEU (Vancouver Child Care), CUPE 116, CUPE 2950, IUOE 882, and Technicians & Research Assistants (Non-Union Techs).

Faculty and staff self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities represent 3.8% of those who submitted an equity questionnaire, and are represented at a rate above 3.8% in such bargaining units as BCGEU (Vancouver Child Care), CUPE 116, CUPE 2950, and Faculty (Faculty Association).

Amongst faculty and staff, 7.2% of the Vancouver Campus self-identify in the survey as part of the broader Sexual/Gender Diversity category. Representation in this category is at or above 7.2% of survey respondents for such bargaining units as CUPE116, Excluded M&P, Exec Admin, Faculty (Faculty Association), Service Unit Directors, and Senior Executives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bargaining Unit</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples</th>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>Sexual /Gender Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU UBC - Vancouver*</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE116b</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE2278 (Non-CR Instructors)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE2950c</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Management &amp; Professional</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Admin (non-union clerical)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Faculty Association)</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Non-Faculty Association)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Union of Operation Engineers B82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Professional (AAPS)</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Unit Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Executives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>12,819</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
a = BCGEU UBC-Vancouver includes BCGEU UBC-Vancouver, BCGEU UBC-Vancouver Kids Club and BCGEU UBC-Vancouver (Auxiliary).
b = CUPE116 includes CUPE116 (Aquatic Centre), CUPE116 (Clerk, Secretary, Bookstore), and CUPE116 (Service, Techns, Trades).
c = CUPE2950 includes CUPE2950 (Chan Centre) and CUPE2950 (Clerk, Secretary, Library).
d = Sr. Executives include Sr. Executives - Academic and Sr. Executives - Administrative.
Please note that for reasons of small sample size the following groups have been excluded: Agassiz Farm Workers and Non Union Childcare Auxiliary.
e = The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transgender, intersex, asexual +, or other analogous term.
Okanagan Campus

At UBC’s Okanagan Campus (Table 19) women represent 56.3% of faculty and staff, and exceed this level in bargaining units as such as BCGEU Okanagan, Exec Admin, Faculty (Non-Faculty Association), and AAPS. For faculty and staff 3.0% self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples, with representation higher than 3.0% in BCGEU Okanagan and AAPS. Self-identified Visible Minorities, which make up 11.7% of faculty and staff, are represented at a higher rate for both categories of faculty. For staff and faculty 4.8% of those completing the questionnaire self-identify as Persons with Disabilities, with representation higher than this rate for such bargaining units as Exec Admin and Faculty (Faculty Association). Faculty and staff self-identifying within the Sexual/Gender Diversity group are 5.7% of the total, and representation is higher than this percentage for Faculty (Faculty Association).

Table 19 Representation of Designated Groups by Bargaining Unit, UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bargaining Unit</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Aboriginal Peoples</th>
<th>Visible Minorities</th>
<th>Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>Sexual / Gender Diversity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCGEU UBC Vancouver</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE116b</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE2278 (Non-CR Instructors)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPE2950a</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded Management &amp; Professional</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Admin (non-union clerical)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Faculty Association)</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Non-Faculty Association)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Union of Operation Engineers B82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Professional (AAPS)</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Unit Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Executives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>12,819</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
The following groups have been excluded for privacy reasons due to the small number of incumbents: Excluded M&P, Service Unit Directors, Sr. Executives.
a = The Sexual/Gender Diversity category includes those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning; trans*, transsexual, intersex, asexual*, or other analogous term.
Conclusion

In keeping with UBC’s commitments to achieve its strategic goals and also to comply with the requirements of the Federal Contractors Program, this report provides several insights about UBC’s profile of faculty and staff based on designated groups and Occupational Groups.

For the Vancouver Campus, Women are represented at a rate that is above the Canada Census comparison for more than half of Occupational Groups. The percentage of survey participants self-identifying as Aboriginal Peoples is at a lower level than the national workforce but at the same level as the local workforce. The percentage has increased from the previous year in both number and proportion. The percentage of survey participants self-identifying as Visible Minorities is at a level above that of the Canadian workforce but below that of the Vancouver workforce. Persons with Disabilities self-identify at a level that is below the national and provincial labour market. Representation amongst those self-identifying within our Sexual/Gender Diversity category has increased in proportion and in number.

Regarding UBC’s hiring trends on the Vancouver Campus, Women are hired at a rate which is higher than the Census Canada comparison market. The Vancouver Campus hires those who self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples at a rate that is below the Vancouver and national labour markets. Those who self-identify as Visible Minorities are hired at a level that is lower than the local labour market, but higher than the national labour market. For those self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities, we are hiring at a rate that is below the provincial and national comparison.

On the Okanagan Campus, Women are represented above the level of the external market, both overall and for most Occupational Groups. For Aboriginal Peoples, representation is below the Kelowna and national average, and has declined slightly from the year prior. For those self-identifying as Visible Minorities, UBC has representation above the external comparison for six of the eight occupational groups. Those self-identifying as Persons with Disabilities are represented at a rate that is below the provincial comparison group overall, however there are three occupational groups where UBC’s representation is higher than the external market.

UBC’s hiring trends on the Okanagan Campus are higher than the Census Canada comparison market for Women. The Okanagan Campus hires those who self-identify as Aboriginal Peoples at a rate that is higher the national and regional comparison market. UBC recruits people who self-identify as Visible Minorities at a higher rate than the pre-existing complement of faculty and staff, and also above the average for the Kelowna labour market. For Persons with Disabilities, UBC recruits people who self-identify at a lower percentage rate than the pre-existing representation, and also below the average for the provincial and national labour market.

Regarding those self-identifying within the Sexual/Gender Diversity group, 7.2% of the Vancouver Campus and 5.7% of the Okanagan Campus self-identify as part of this designated group. UBC hires candidates at a percentage rate that is above the pre-existing population within the Vancouver Campus, but below the pre-existing population within the Okanagan Campus.

Through the office of the Associate Vice President, Equity & Inclusion, education, outreach and proactive strategies focused on improving equity employment are offered on both campuses. For example, the annual Equity Enhancement Fund supports community-led initiatives that build student, faculty and staff competencies related to issues of equity, diversity and inclusion. The office also delivers professional development workshops, supports interviewing and hiring practices, offers guidance and support to those with human rights concerns, and facilitates dialogues around conflict engagement and strategic planning. In July 2016, Dr. Jennifer Love was appointed as Senior Advisor to the Provost on Women Faculty, to continue pre-existing successes in promoting faculty diversity through policy development, advancement and leadership, and ongoing research. A similar Senior Advisor to the Provost role is being created to address concerns of faculty who are Visible Minorities.

Several administrative departments (for example Access & Diversity) co-ordinate disability-related accommodations for employees who require equipment or mobility assistance. The Campus and Community Planning unit works to resolve physical accessibility issues on campus. UBC’s Return-to-Work team helps many staff stay at work or return to work during or after an illness or disability.

In recent years there has been an increased focus on wellbeing at UBC. These initiatives include the establishment of the UBC Wellbeing Initiative, the eighth successful year of UBC Thrive, the 2016 signing of the Okanagan Charter: An International Charter for Health Promoting Universities and Colleges, the extension
of the 30 Day Online Mindfulness Challenge beyond the pilot program, the expansion of the Mental Health First Aid facilitation, the hiring of two Senior Managers, Workplace Mental Health, the extension of the Not Myself Today Campaign into its second year, and the awarding of Golden Apple Awards on the Okanagan Campus. These efforts are pro-active in their contribution to a community health orientation to mental health and wellbeing.

Recently, UBC created a presence on aboriginalcareers.ca, to extend our advertising reach beyond paper advertisements previously sent to Band offices. The Positive Space Campaign is a campus-wide initiative to help make UBC more receptive and welcoming to the Sexual/Gender Diversity community, offering workshops and supporting resource-person advocates in the workplace. UBC continues to deliver Selection Interviewing Workshops to ensure recruiters understand effective recruitment practices that avoid discrimination. The University also delivers presentations to recruitment panels for senior positions - up to and including the position of President - to ensure panels consider the impact of personal bias and the value of diversity. There is also a formal education process on the prevention of bullying and harassment. UBC provides a variety of general practices to encourage skills growth and career mobility. Because historically-disadvantaged groups are more likely to face obstacles in these areas, we expect these robust practices to improve equity and equality. Specific examples include: a formal career navigation service; an ongoing funding commitment to provide on-line learning through Lynda.com to staff and faculty free of charge; the expansion of professional development funding for several bargaining units; a variety of leadership development programs; and coaching services.

Campus-wide expectations of metrics-based decision-making are growing and evolving, as UBC begins to consider new options to re-fresh its approach and increase its own standards. UBC enters its second century with growing expectations that everyone will meet and exceed compliance standards and increasingly break new ground. Employment Equity is part of this effort.

The re-survey of the UBC population on both campuses provided significantly more robust data than has been available in the past. As a result, we are now in a position to undertake an Employment Systems Review and update the existing Employment Equity Plan to address the areas of under-representation that have been identified in this report. Throughout 2017 and 2018, we will undertake the review of systems, processes and policies related to employment at UBC and use this as a basis to update our Employment Equity Plan.
APPENDIX A

TABLE CONVERSION KEY

Table 20 lists the tables provided in this year as well as prior year’s report in sequential order, and also provides the table numbers in those prior reports. This table is intended to assist those who are comparing data year-over-year. It should be noted that between 2011 and 2012 UBC chose to shorten the Report to mostly focus on data that was required by the Federal Contractors Program. Please note that any comparisons of students to faculty and staff have been dropped; while meaningful in many respects, this information is not directly relevant to the purposes of this Report. Directors, and Senior Executives.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Representation of Sexual/Gender Diversity - Vancouver Campus</td>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
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<td>Table 9</td>
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<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Figure 3a (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Representation of Visible Minorities - Okanagan Campus</td>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Figure 3a (iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
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<td>Table 11</td>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Figure 3a (iv)</td>
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<td>Table 13</td>
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<td>Table 16</td>
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<td>Table 16</td>
<td>Table 15</td>
<td>Figure 13</td>
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<td>Table 20</td>
<td>Table Conversion Key</td>
<td>Table 19</td>
<td>Table 18</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Table 21</td>
<td>Return Rate of Questionnaire - Vancouver Campus</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
<td>Table 19</td>
<td>Figure 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 22</td>
<td>Return Rate of Questionnaire - Okanagan Campus</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
<td>Table 20</td>
<td>Figure 2a</td>
</tr>
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<td>Table 23</td>
<td>Response Rate of Questionnaire - Vancouver Campus</td>
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</table>
APPENDIX B

RETURN AND RESPONSE RATE OF THE UBC EMPLOYMENT EQUITY CENSUS QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the ninth Employment Equity Report at UBC that is exclusively using the data gathered from the UBC Employment Equity Census Questionnaire initiated in November 2008. The data used throughout this report is the snapshot of questionnaire results as of October 15, 2016.

Tables 21-22 show the “return rate” or UBC’s percentage participation rate compared to the baseline population, for UBC’s Employment Equity Census Questionnaire by staff and faculty across UBC’s Vancouver and Okanagan campuses. The return rate is 72.2% for the Vancouver Campus which reflects a high increase from the year prior due to the re-survey of the workforce population. The return rate is 80.0% for the Okanagan Campus, which also reflects a strong increase from the previous year.

Tables 23-24 show the “response rate” or UBC’s percentage of staff and faculty who provided completed questionnaires only, excluding those respondents who submitted a questionnaire instrument but declined to answer the questions. The response rate is 67.9% for the Vancouver Campus which reflects an increase from the year prior. The response rate is 77.8% for the Okanagan Campus, which also reflects an increase from the previous year due to the re-survey of the workforce population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Return Rate (Includes Declined-to-Answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor-Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22 Return Rate of Employment Equity Questionnaire
UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Return Rate (Includes Declined-to-Answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor-Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report. 
n.a. = Not applicable or not available. Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Groups (EEOG) numbers 7, 9, 12, 13 and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.

### Table 23 Response Rate of Employment Equity Questionnaire
UBC Vancouver Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Response Rate (Completed Questionnaires Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor-Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 Response Rate of Employment Equity Questionnaire
UBC Okanagan Campus (Effective October of Each Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Response Rate (Completed Questionnaires Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Senior Managers</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Middle &amp; Other Managers</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University Professors</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professionals</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-Professionals &amp; Technicians</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor-Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative &amp; Senior Clerical</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Skilled Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Skilled Crafts &amp; Trades</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clerical Personnel</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intermediate Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Semi-Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Manual Workers</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = data suppressed due to insufficient data to report.

n.a. = Not applicable or not available. Please note that the UBC Okanagan Campus does not have any positions that are matched to Occupational Groups (EEOG) numbers 7, 9, 12, 13 and 15. However, we have provided the rows with n.a. in each cell to allow easier comparison to other tables.
APPENDIX C

TERMINOLOGY FOR SEXUAL/GENDER DIVERSITY

This report provides data and analysis regarding UBC’s representation by people who self-identify as within “Sexual/Gender Diversity”. This wording is intended as a broad-based category which includes a variety of topics, for which draft terminology is part of a work in progress.

Sexual diversity describes behaviors, identities, and expressions that occur outside of the mainstream heterosexual (i.e. male/female) romantic or sexual pairing. Transgender includes gender identities and expressions that do not presume that women are feminine and men are masculine, or that we must conform to the sexual stereotypes of our external environment. Transsexual includes those who were born into a biological sex (male/female) which is different from their gender (masculine/feminine) identity or expression, some of whom undergo medical transformation to have their body match their gender identity. Trans* is an umbrella term used to capture the diversity of people who might identify with transgender or transsexual identities and communities.

There are limitations in measuring and categorizing people by equity categories, in part because the surveys rely on self-identification, and individuals may have different ways of describing themselves. As well, the use of words evolves over time. By contrast, the mechanism for measuring, reporting, and subsequently representing various campus groups relies on the fixed categories in survey research. While there are opportunities to update the survey categories occasionally, comparisons over time can be disrupted by frequent changes of measurement.

The draft terminology for Sexual/Gender Diversity is described by the Equity & Inclusion Office as follows:

The acronym LGBT*QTIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer or Questioning, Transsexual, Intersex, Asexual +) is generally used by the Positive Space Campaign. A plus sign (+) is added to the end of the acronym to incorporate identities outside this acronym.

What are sexual orientation and gender identity?

It is important to remember that sexual and gender identity are distinct concepts. Because LGBT*QTIA+ includes terms for sexual orientation and gender identity, the difference between these two concepts can get obscured. While we all possess a sexual orientation and gender identity, one’s sexual orientation says or determines nothing about one’s sexual identity and vice versa. Sexual orientation deals with attraction to others while gender identity deals with how one sees oneself along a continuum of gender possibilities, independent of attraction.

At the time of writing, the normal parlance for the Sexual/Gender Diversity community is LGBT*QTIA+. In recognition that the inclusive terminology is always evolving, UBC uses a more general term of “Sexual/Gender Diversity”.


APPENDIX D

METHODOLOGY NOTES

The workforce analysis compares UBC’s internal workforce of designated group members (i.e., Women, Visible Minorities, Aboriginal Peoples, and Persons with Disabilities) with each group’s representation in the relevant external labour pool. This is done in order to determine the degree of equity representation in each “Occupational Group,” technically known as Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs). Determining representation and concentration of designated group members at UBC makes it possible to develop realistic goals and timetables in achieving greater equity.

When reporting on the percent representation of a particular designated group, UBC reports the percentage of all people identifying as a member of the designated group. On a row-by-row basis, UBC also reports on the number of people within a particular Occupational Group (EEOG) who are part of an equity category, and also the percentage of people within that Occupational Group (which is the number of people self-identifying in the designated group, divided by the number of survey respondents for that particular Occupational Group). For the overall data, the whole data sample is the denominator, whereas for individual rows of data, the number of survey respondents within that Occupational Group is the denominator. UBC’s data is effective October 31 of each year with the exception of 2016, where October 15 data was used in order to take advantage of a comprehensive data set created for other purposes.

Data for UBC’s internal workforce comes from two sources: employee records that are pre-existing in UBC’s Human Resource Management System (HRMS), and confidential survey data from UBC’s Employment Equity Census which resides in a secure and confidential location within UBC’s Human Resource Management System. The Census has a participation rate of 72.2% for the Vancouver Campus and 80.0% for the Okanagan Campus, as described in Appendix B. As such, this report is interpreting a sample of the population of employees.

For the tables in this report, all information on an employee’s sex is taken from employee records in HRMS, for all who are eligible to participate in the Employment Equity Census. By contrast, the tables in all other areas including Visible Minorities, Persons with Disabilities, Aboriginal Peoples, and all supplemental questions, the information is taken exclusively from self-identification responses from the Employment Equity Census itself.

The terms “Comparison to Census” and “external labour market” are used to refer to data from Canadian Census 2011, in most cases. Canadian labour force data is drawn from the 2011 Canadian Census Employment Equity Data Report. The underlying data within the Canadian Census describes equity representation amongst people 15 years of age or older who worked in Canada in 2010 or 2011, except for Persons with Disabilities, to which the data refers to people aged 15 to 64 years and who worked in 2011 or 2012. In prior years’ reports this external comparison data was described as “Availability Data” to reflect labour market availability. Availability is the normal terminology amongst those with advanced knowledge of employment equity reporting. UBC has attempted to use plain language in this report to make it accessible.

This report provides information on Sexual/Gender Diversity representation at UBC; however, labour market data from the Canadian Census is not available for comparison purposes in the same manner as the groups designated by legislation.

For most Occupational Groups, UBC uses market data based on municipality, as described in Table 1 of this Report, with the exception of Persons with Disabilities for which only provincial data is available. By contrast, UBC uses external labour market data at the national level for Senior Managers and University Professors. Some Senior Managers and University Professors are recruited internationally, and it may be relevant to consider international labour market data for comparison purposes. However, international labour market data is outside of the scope of this compliance report.
For those tables reporting data broken down by Bargaining Unit, we use Union Code records that exist within our HRMS. Bargaining Unit and Union Code are designated by the terms of union certifications as assessed by UBC human resources, in compliance with provincial legislation and the related mechanisms for feedback from the employee groups themselves. For the purposes of this report, numbers of five or less in an overall occupational category are suppressed. This is being done for two reasons. First, reporting responses when there are only a few people in an occupational category may have the effect of disclosing personal information. Second, data from such a small sample may be misleading or lead to inaccurate conclusions.

Please also note that the tables in this report provide information on all University Professors combined; however, other types of information can be made available on request.

This report was written between December 2016 and July 2017 as a combined effort involving staff in the Workforce Planning team of UBC Human Resources, Planning and Institutional Research (PAIR), the Equity and Inclusion Office, and with some use of the pre-existing wording of the authors of prior years’ reports.
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ABOUT THE WES
The UBC Workplace Experiences Survey (WES) was conducted November 1 to 21, 2017.
• The WES is intended to:
  • Give faculty and staff the opportunity to provide quantitative and qualitative feedback about their workplace experience
  • Identify trends, areas of strength, and areas of opportunity at the UBC-wide and individual Faculty/department levels
  • Compare 2017 results to the WES conducted in 2014 and 2011, where possible
  • Compare 2017 results to other relevant benchmarks
What is Engagement?
The Workplace Experiences Survey focuses on faculty & staff engagement: “An individual’s cognitive, emotional and behavioural state directed towards desired organizational outcomes.”

Essentially we are measuring the commitment of faculty and staff, which impacts their ability to do their best work, and contribute to the overall success of UBC.
WHY UBC FACULTY & STAFF ENGAGEMENT MATTERS

Faculty & staff engagement

research excellence

innovation

teaching & learning

community engagement

student experience
TALENTMAP’S ENGAGEMENT MODEL

Engaging Workplace
- Faculty Support
- Academic Excellence
- Faculty Tenure & Promotion
- Work Environment
- Professional Growth
- Work/Life Integration
- Communications
- Collaboration
- Innovation
- Student Focus
- Immediate Unit
- Head/Manager
- UBC’s Senior Leadership
- Health and Wellbeing
- Inclusion & Respect

Engaged Attitudes
- Proud
- Focused
- Optimistic
- Determined
- Resilient
- Flexible
- Committed
- Connected
- Motivated
- Inspired
- Emotionally Invested

Engaged Behaviours
- Discretionary Effort
- Persistent
- Helpful
- Collaborative
- Takes Initiative
- Ambassador

UBC Results
- Research Excellence
- Teaching & Learning
- Student Experience
- Innovation
- Community Engagement
- Retention
No data or reports will be provided unless there are at least ten (10) respondents.
TRENDS: HOW WE ARE DOING
FACULTY & STAFF OVERALL PARTICIPATION

Margin of error for 6,093 responses is 1% at 95% confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Employee Count</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4678</td>
<td>9995</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6093</td>
<td>15178</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Engagement

I am proud to tell others I work at UBC.
I would recommend UBC to a friend as a great place to work.
My work provides me with a sense of personal accomplishment.
I can see a clear link between my work and UBC’s long-term objectives.

Note: The 2017, 2014 and 2011 Overall Engagement scores are the average of the 4 questions.
Gives me effective feedback on the work I do.
Involves me in decisions that affect my work.
Supports my professional development and learning.
Keeps me well informed.

Immediate unit head/manager trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UBC 2014</th>
<th>UBC 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives me effective feedback on the work I do.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves me in decisions that affect my work.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports my professional development and learning.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps me well informed.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+7 (+/- 2014)  
+21 (+/- 2014)  
+4 (+/- 2014)  
+1 (+/- 2014)  

UBC’s Senior leadership trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UBC 2014</th>
<th>UBC 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate a compelling vision for UBC.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in UBC’s senior leadership.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+13 (+/- 2014)  
+16 (+/- 2014)
I am satisfied with the resources that UBC provides to support my teaching.

I am satisfied with the resources that UBC provides to support my research.

I am satisfied with the resources that UBC provides to support my educational leadership.

I am able to meet expectations related to teaching.

I am able to meet expectations related to research.

I am able to meet expectations related to service.

I believe decisions about reappointments are made fairly.

I believe decisions about tenure are made fairly.

I believe decisions about promotions are made fairly.

I believe decisions about leadership appointments are made fairly.

The process for earning tenure or promotion is clear.

The criteria for earning tenure or promotion is clear.

The body of evidence considered for earning tenure or promotion is clear.

FACULTY TREND

FACULTY: Faculty Support trend

FACULTY: Academic Excellence

FACULTY: Faculty Tenure & Promotion trend
Considering everything, I am satisfied with my current role at UBC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>WORK ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH</th>
<th>COLLABORATION</th>
<th>STUDENT FOCUS</th>
<th>HEALTH &amp; WELLBEING</th>
<th>INCLUSION &amp; RESPECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBC 2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>UBC 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7 (± 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+19 (± 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work effectively.

I have access to the information I need to do my work effectively.

At UBC, I have the opportunity to learn and grow professionally.

My career aspirations can be achieved at UBC.

I receive recognition from my accomplishments at work.

I would recommend UBC to prospective students.

I know how to access benefits, services and programs that adequately support my health and wellbeing.

I feel supported in my workplace when I am dealing with personal or family issues.

People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace.

I feel that I am part of a community at UBC.
2017 SURVEY RESULTS – HIGHLIGHTS
Note: %unfav, %neutral, and %fav scores are rounded to the nearest whole number, and may add up to 99% or 101%.

*Note: 2014 & 2011 Overall Engagement scores are calculated based on an average of 4 common questions with 2017.

### Overall Engagement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+/⁻ UBC 2014</th>
<th>+/⁻ UBC 2011</th>
<th>+/- TM Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1*</td>
<td>+4*</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Engagement Scores

1. **I am proud to tell others I work at UBC.**
   - Unfavourable: 4%
   - Neutral: 18%
   - Favourable: 83%
   - +5  
   - +7  
   - +2

2. **I am optimistic about the future of UBC.**
   - Unfavourable: 8%
   - Neutral: 18%
   - Favourable: 75%
   - n/a
   - n/a
   - +2  

3. **UBC inspires me to do my best work.**
   - Unfavourable: 10%
   - Neutral: 25%
   - Favourable: 65%
   - n/a
   - n/a
   - -5

4. **I would recommend UBC to a friend as a great place to work.**
   - Unfavourable: 10%
   - Neutral: 19%
   - Favourable: 71%
   - 0%
   - 0%
   - +2

5. **My work provides me with a sense of personal accomplishment.**
   - Unfavourable: 10%
   - Neutral: 16%
   - Favourable: 74%
   - +7
   - +9
   - -2

6. **I can see a clear link between my work and UBC's long-term objectives.**
   - Unfavourable: 16%
   - Neutral: 28%
   - Favourable: 56%
   - -7
   - +2
   - -11
ENGAGEMENT SCORE BREAKDOWNS

- **Staff**
  - Unfavourable: 8
  - Neutral: 20
  - Favourable: 72
  - Count: 4678

- **Faculty**
  - Unfavourable: 14
  - Neutral: 20
  - Favourable: 66
  - Count: 1415
THINKING OF LEAVING (%YES)

In the past 3 years, I have actively searched for a job outside of UBC (% Yes)

- **Staff**
  - UBC 2014: 41%
  - UBC 2017: 38%
  - n = 4678

- **Faculty**
  - UBC 2014: 38%
  - UBC 2017: 35%
  - n = 1415
Please indicate why you have been actively searching for a job outside of UBC in the past 3 years.

- To improve your opportunities for career advancement: 63%
- To increase salary: 59%
- To address the cost of living: 39%
- To find a more supportive work environment: 35%
- To reduce stress: 35%
- To seek more challenging work: 30%
- To reduce commuting time: 28%
- To pursue a different career (academic or not academic): 25%
- To find a better manager: 25%
- Other: 19%
- To address family-related issues: 8%
- To increase time for research: 8%
- To go back to school: 5%
- To address personal health reasons: 5%
Note: The Faculty Support, Academic Excellence and Faculty Tenure & Promotion dimensions were only completed by tenure-stream faculty.
KEY DRIVERS OF ENGAGEMENT - FACULTY
Hypothesized Drivers

- Faculty Support
- Academic Excellence
- Faculty Tenure & Promotion
- Work Environment
- Professional Growth
- Work/Life Integration
- Communications
- Collaboration
- Innovation
- Student Focus
- Immediate Unit Head/Manager
- UBC’s Senior Leadership
- Health & Wellbeing
- Inclusion & Respect

Regression Analysis

- #1 Professional Growth
- #2 UBC’s Senior Leadership
- #3 Student Focus

Faculty Engagement
KEY STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITY AREAS - FACULTY

- **High Performance Score (% fav)**
  - Academic Excellence
  - Work Environment
  - Inclusion & Respect
  - Student Focus
  - Professional Growth
  - UBC’s Senior Leadership

- **Low Performance Score (% fav)**
  - Weak Engagement Driver
  - Faculty Tenure & Promotion
  - Immediate Unit Head/Manager
  - Health & Wellbeing
  - Innovation
  - Faculty Support
  - Collaboration
  - Work/Life Integration
  - Communications

- **Opportunities For Improvement**
  - Strong Engagement Driver
  - Medium/Low priority

- **Maintain: Keep doing well**
  - Opportunities For Improvement

- **Leverage & Expand**

---

UBC’s Senior Leadership

- Communications

---

**TalentMap**

Employee Insights at Work
PRIORITIZING OPPORTUNITIES

- Improving engagement should be focused on dimensions exhibiting a combination of **low performance scores and strong drivers**.
- Focusing on the lower dimension scores exclusively may not fully address what is needed to target and improve engagement.

![Diagram showing engagement categories and strategies](image)

- **High Performance Score (fav)**
  - **“Maintain: Keep doing well”**
    - High Performance Score + Weak Engagement Driver
  - **“Leverage & Expand”**
    - High Performance Score + Strong Engagement Driver

- **Weak Engagement Driver**

- **Low Performance Score (fav)**
  - **“Medium/ Low Priority”**
    - Low Performance Score + Weak Engagement Driver
  - **Opportunities for Improvement**
    - Low Performance Score + Strong Engagement Driver

- **Strong Engagement Driver**

High need for improvement coupled with powerful drivers of engagement.
### PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (KEY DRIVER #1) - FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Professional Growth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my work presents a stimulating and welcomed challenge.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At UBC, I have the opportunity to learn and grow professionally.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My career aspirations can be achieved at UBC.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can make a positive impact at work.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of the following issues are barriers to you in achieving your career aspirations at UBC?

- My workload
- Lack of manager/unit head’s help and support
- The process for advancing my career is not clear to me
- The number of career opportunities are too limited
- Lack of mentor to support my career objectives
- There are not enough positions available
- The requirements for advancing my career are not clear to me
- Preference appears to be given to external candidates
- I am not given the opportunity to acquire the skills required to advance my career
- Promotions are not conducted fairly
- Other (please specify)
- The career opportunities that are available are not well-advertised
- My sex
- Too much responsibility at home and outside of work
- My age
- I do not have the qualifications require to advance my career
- My ethnic or cultural origin
- I have not run into any barriers trying to achieve my career aspirations at UBC
- My disability
- My religious affiliation
- My sexual orientation

490 respondents selected a theme for this comment.
Overall UBC's Senior Leadership: 22% Unfavourable, 32% Neutral, 46% Favourable

Set ambitious, but realistic priorities: 19% Unfavourable, 35% Neutral, 46% Favourable

Clearly communicate their priorities: 23% Unfavourable, 31% Neutral, 46% Favourable

Act in a manner that is consistent with what they say: 23% Unfavourable, 33% Neutral, 45% Favourable

Communicate a compelling vision for UBC: 21% Unfavourable, 31% Neutral, 48% Favourable

I have confidence in UBC's senior leadership: 24% Unfavourable, 29% Neutral, 47% Favourable

Overall, the confidence in UBC's senior leadership has increased from +12 to +16 since 2014.
Overall Student Focus

I would recommend UBC to prospective students.

In my department/unit, there are sufficient resources to support students.

I am able to make a positive impact on the student experience at UBC.
KEY DRIVERS OF ENGAGEMENT - STAFF
Hypothesized Drivers

- WORK ENVIRONMENT
- PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
- WORK/LIFE INTEGRATION
- COMMUNICATIONS
- COLLABORATION
- INNOVATION
- STUDENT FOCUS
- IMMEDIATE UNIT HEAD/MANAGER
- UBC'S SENIOR LEADERSHIP
- HEALTH & WELLBEING
- INCLUSION & RESPECT

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

- #1 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH
- #2 INCLUSION & RESPECT
- #3 UBC'S SENIOR LEADERSHIP

Staff Engagement
KEY STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITY AREAS - STAFF

- **Work Environment**
- **Health & Wellbeing**
- **Immediate Unit Head/Manager**
- **Innovation**
- **Collaboration**
- **Work/Life Integration**
- **Inclusion & Respect**
- **Student Focus**
- **UBC’s Senior Leadership**

**High Performance Score (% fav)**

**Low Performance Score (% fav)**

- **“Maintain: Keep doing well”**
- **“Leverage & Expand”**

**Weak Engagement Driver**

**Strong Engagement Driver**

**“Medium/ Low priority”**

**Opportunities For Improvement**
At UBC, I have the opportunity to learn and grow professionally. 

My career aspirations can be achieved at UBC.

I feel I can make a positive impact at work.
Which of the following issues are barriers to you in achieving your career aspirations at UBC?

- The process for advancing my career is not clear to me (45%)
- The number of career opportunities are too limited (42%)
- Lack of mentor to support my career objectives (40%)
- The requirements for advancing my career are not clear to me (37%)
- There are not enough positions available (36%)
- Lack of manager/unit head’s help and support (36%)
- I am not given the opportunity to acquire the skills required to advance my career (28%)
- My workload (27%)
- Promotions are not conducted fairly (25%)
- The career opportunities that are available are not well-advertised (20%)
- Preference appears to be given to external candidates (16%)
- I do not have the qualifications require to advance my career (16%)
- My age (14%)
- Too much responsibility at home and outside of work (13%)
- Other (please specify) (12%)
- I have not run into any barriers trying to achieve my career aspirations at UBC (7%)
- My ethnic or cultural origin (6%)
- My sex (5%)
- My disability (2%)
- My sexual orientation (1%)
- My religious affiliation (1%)
INCLUSION & RESPECT (KEY DRIVER #2) - STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>+/- UBC 2014</th>
<th>+/- TM Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Inclusion &amp; Respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in my workplace.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My diversity is valued in my workplace.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how I can contribute to a respectful workplace.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my workplace, differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC has effective policies and practices for addressing inappropriate behavior.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am part of a community at UBC.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall UBC's Senior Leadership
- Unfavourable: 11
- Neutral: 30
- Favourable: 59

Set ambitious, but realistic priorities.
- Unfavourable: 10
- Neutral: 32
- Favourable: 58

Clearly communicate their priorities.
- Unfavourable: 14
- Neutral: 29
- Favourable: 57

Act in a manner that is consistent with what they say.
- Unfavourable: 11
- Neutral: 31
- Favourable: 58

Communicate a compelling vision for UBC.
- Unfavourable: 10
- Neutral: 28
- Favourable: 62

I have confidence in UBC's senior leadership.
- Unfavourable: 11
- Neutral: 28
- Favourable: 61

+- UBC 2014
--- +13
--- +16

+- TM Benchmark
--- +3
--- -5
NEXT STEPS: YOUR ROLE
The Workplace Experiences Survey is an initial step in creating better workplace experiences at UBC.
WHAT’S NEXT

Feb 9: presentation posted
Feb 13: Reports shared
Feb & Mar: Results sharing Faculties & departments
Spring onwards: Deeper analysis of survey results
Spring: Identify opportunities for UBC overall

Resources & Contacts:

Visit: [http://ubc.ca/wes](http://ubc.ca/wes).

Contact [workplace.surveys@ubc.ca](mailto:workplace.surveys@ubc.ca) or your HR Advisor.
Thank you!
UBC’s report to the BC Human Rights Tribunal on the Gender Pay Gap in Professorial Salaries at UBC

2018
Section 1 – Salary Analysis

A. Data and Descriptive Statistics

Our analysis focused on currently active faculty members who were hired before December 4, 2012 and therefore potentially eligible to receive the 2013 pay equity adjustment. Following the 2010 UBC Pay Equity study and subsequent agreements with the Faculty Association, all women faculty members hired before that date received a 2% lump sum pay increase. The purpose of the current study was to determine whether or not the 2013 adjustment ameliorated the pay gap. By comparison with the 2010 study, the sample included in this study also included faculty members from UBC-Okanagan and Instructors, Senior Instructors and Professors of Teaching from the Educational Leadership stream, as these constituencies were included in the adjustment. Consistent with the 2010 study, the sample does not include eligible faculty members from the Faculty of Medicine faculty members. We also excluded 18 faculty members who are academic administrators and therefore not members of the Faculty Association. These specifications leave us with 1,572 faculty members, 561 of which are women. Table 1 shows their distribution across academic ranks, as well as the corresponding average and median salaries.

Table 1. Average and Median Research Faculty Members - December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>% of All</th>
<th>Share of Women</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Median Salary</th>
<th>Ratio2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>174077</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>171060</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>158664</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>152200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>195214</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>185366</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>187488</td>
<td></td>
<td>179178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>149797</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>143076</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>148143</td>
<td></td>
<td>145715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>128645</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>122730</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>134693</td>
<td></td>
<td>123596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Prof Teach</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>162778</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>154662</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Prof Teach</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>147406</td>
<td></td>
<td>147647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Senior Instr</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>131676</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>129104</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Senior Instr</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>123185</td>
<td></td>
<td>121430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes all faculty members hired before December 4, 2012 as described in the text above. Omits information on instructors because of small sample. % of All indicates % of All Men or Women in the indicated Rank. Share of Women is in the indicated Rank. Ratio is of female to male salaries.

The proportion of women found at each rank is different from the overall proportion of women. Women are still underrepresented at the rank of Full Professor and overrepresented at all of the other ranks, in particular in the Educational Leadership stream. The raw female/male average salary ratio within ranks has been overturned at the Assistant level, it has narrowed substantially at the Associate level, but

---

1 The following individuals are members of the current working group: Jennifer Berdahl, Bekkah Coburn, Sara-Jane Finlay, Nicole Fortin, Shanda Jordan Gaetz, James Johnson, Sandy Liu, Jennifer Love, Oxana Marmer, Stephanie McKeown, Dory Nason, Deena Rubuliak, Vinayak Vatsal
stayed the same at the Full Professor level. The overall gender ratio has slightly narrowed from an average of 0.89 in 2010 to 0.91 in 2017, and from 0.88 in 2010 to 0.89 in 2017 for the median. More generally, gender ratios in median salaries are comparable to the ratios of average salaries. The meager improvement in the overall gender ratios by comparison to the within-rank ratios, some of which exceed parity, is largely a reflection of gender differences in representation at higher professorial ranks.

The following explanatory variables used in the current analysis expand on the variables used in the 2010 study to reflect the wider range and type of experience among current faculty members. The previous variables included: professorial ranks, several distinguished chairs, number of years in professorial ranks, and administrative units. Additional explanatory variables, denoted by an asterisk *, simply extend the previous categories to the newly available groups, such as Professor of Teaching or Instructor. These will be used in Specification 1, which most resembles that of the previous study. Other new variables, denoted by an asterisk **, are meant to capture more detailed controls for experience; they include type of appointment, numbers of years in executive positions, and starting rank at appointment. These will be used in Specification 2. The exhaustive list is reported below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Salary</td>
<td>Nominal 2017 $CAN [part of the analysis is conducted using log(CurrrentSalary)]</td>
<td>Dependent variable. Salaries not reduced by sabbatical or other leaves. Administrative stipends are not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(=1 if Female, 0 if Male)</td>
<td>The average difference between female and male salaries, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial Ranks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>(=1 if Full Professor, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of full professors and the base category group, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>(=1 if Associate Professor, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of associate professors and the base category group, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>(=1 if Assistant Professor, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of assistant professors and the base category group, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Prof. of Teaching</td>
<td>(=1 if Professor of Teaching, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of associate professors and the base category group, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Senior Instructor</td>
<td>(=1 if Senior Instructor, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of associate professors and the base category group, all else being equal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instructor</td>
<td>Base Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Canada Excellence</td>
<td>(=1 if CERC, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of CERC and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Killam Professor</td>
<td>(=1 if Killam Professor, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of Killam Professors and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Research Chair</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tier 1</td>
<td>(=1 if CRC1, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of CRC-Tier1 and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Research Chair</strong>&lt;br&gt;Tier 2</td>
<td>(=1 if CRC2, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of CRC-Tier 2 and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguished University Professor/Scholar</strong></td>
<td>(=1 if DUP, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of DUPs and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinguished University Professor/Scholar Later years</strong></td>
<td>(=1 if LDUP, 0 Otherwise)</td>
<td>The average difference between salaries of DUPs and the reference group (all others), all else being equal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of Appointment**

| **Grant Tenure Appointment** | (=1 if GRT, 0 Otherwise) | The average difference between salaries of grant tenured professors and the base category group, all else being equal |
| **Grant Tenure-Track Appointment** | (=1 if GTK, 0 Otherwise) | The average difference between salaries of grant tenure-track professors and the base category group, all else being equal |
| **Tenure-Track Appointment** | (=1 if TRK, 0 Otherwise) | The average difference between salaries of tenure-track professors and the base category group, all else being equal |

**Tenured Appointment** | Base Category |

**Quadratic in Years in Academic Rank**

| **Years in Academic Rank** | years | Number of years in current academic rank. |
| **Years in Rank Squared** | years | Square of previous variable. |

**Years in Executive Position**

| **Years as Senior Executive** | years | Number of years in the Senior Executives stream |
| **Years as Mid-Level Executive** | years | Number of years in the Mid-Executives stream |
| **Years as Senior Executive** | years | Number of years in the Senior Executives stream |
| **Years as Junior Executive** | years | Number of years in the Junior Executives stream |

**Professorial Rank at Hiring**

| **Started at Rank of Full Professor** | (=1 if StFull, 0 Otherwise) | The average difference between salaries of grant tenured professors and the base category group, all else being equal |
| **Started at Rank of Associate** | (=1 if StAssoc, 0 Otherwise) | The average difference between salaries of grant tenured professors and the base category group, all else being equal |
| **Started at Rank of Assistant** | Base Category | |
Table 2 presents some summary descriptive statistics by gender and professorial rank of some of the above explanatory variables, regrouped by categories, with the addition of age. These variables account for different measures of labour market experience and show that gender differences therein have narrowed and are not statistically significant within ranks, except at the Full Professor level. Another striking gender difference appears in the number of faculty members hired as tenured Professors, especially among Full Professors. The only statistically significant gender difference appears in the number of distinguished chairs at the Associate level, which is actually favorable to women.

Table 2. Summary Data (Averages) by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in rank</th>
<th>Years in Exec. Pos.</th>
<th>No. of Chairs</th>
<th>No. Hired Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Prof Teach</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Prof Teach</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Senior Instr</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Senior Instr</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisks indicate significant statistical differences between men and women: *** at the 0.01 level, ** at the 0.05 level and * at the 0.10 level.

Taken together the descriptive statistics reported in Tables 1 and 2 show that gender differences in professorial salaries are less a concern at the lower professorial ranks than at higher professorial
ranks. This could be due not only to possibly slower progression through the ranks but also to a lower likelihood of female faculty being hired at higher ranks than male faculty members.
B. Empirical Methodology

We review the methods used in the economic analysis of discrimination. The two main methods aim to supplement the layperson’s view which sees a positive simple difference, D, in the mean salary between men and women as evidence of discrimination:

\[ D^L = E(Salary|Men) - E(Salary|Women) \]

where \( E(Salary|Men) \) indicates that we are computing the mean of the salaries of men and \( E(Salary|Women) \) indicates that we are computing the mean of the salaries of women. The problem with the layman’s view is that men and women may have different levels of productive characteristics. A typically argument is that women may have lower levels of labour market experience, and we have to take that into account in our computation.

The economist’s view argues that one should account for productivity related characteristics, called \( X \), in the computation of the mean difference, that is we should compute a conditional mean,

\[ D^E = E(Salary|X, Men) - E(Salary|X, Women) \]

For example, the average salaries reported in Table 1 are conditional means on gender and rank, that is where \( X=\text{rank} \).\(^2\) If we assume that we can model the conditional mean salary as a function of the characteristics, \( X \), and use \( F \) as a shorthand for female (\( F=1 \) if a women and 0 if a men), we get the equation

\[ E(Salary|X, F) = X'\beta + \alpha F + E(\varepsilon|X, F) \]  

(1)

where \( X' \) is a vector (comprise many) of characteristics, and \( \varepsilon \) denotes some unobserved characteristics or errors, whose conditional mean goes to zero. We can bring this equation to the data to estimate the parameters \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), which can loosely be interpreted as the price or the return to the characteristics. For example, if \( X \) was years in rank, we would expect \( \beta_{\text{yrs in rank}} \) to be close to the career progression increments, if there were no other yearly salary increases. In practice, we will estimate (1) as a multivariate equation by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS).

If we can agree that there is no gender bias in productive characteristics and that no important characteristics have been omitted, we will see a negative estimated coefficient of the female dummy, \( \hat{\alpha} \), as evidence of discrimination. Of course, our choice of characteristics is rarely ideal, it is thus more accurate to say that the coefficient \( \hat{\alpha} \) captures the salary disadvantage of women that is not “explained” or “accounted for” by the productive characteristics \( X \).

Another popular methodology proposed by Blinder (1973) and Oaxaca (1973) is based on the construction of a counterfactual average salary. The idea is to come up with an adjusted salary gap that would take into account some of the differences in the productive characteristics of men and women. For example, it asks what would be the average salary of women if women’s average characteristics were paid the same price as men’s.

\(^2\) The word “mean” designates a population measure of the first moment of the distribution, while the word “average” is an estimate of the population mean for the sample at hand.
If we had estimated equation (1) separately by gender, using the subscripts \( g=m,f \) to denote the male and female equations, we could write the average salaries by gender, \( \bar{Salary}_m \) and \( \bar{Salary}_f \), as the product of the average characteristics of each gender, \( \bar{X}_m \) and \( \bar{X}_f \), times the gender-specific estimated returns to these characteristics, \( \bar{\beta}_m \) and \( \bar{\beta}_f \),

\[
\bar{Salary}_m = \bar{X}_m \bar{\beta}_m \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Salary}_f = \bar{X}_f \bar{\beta}_f
\]
given that the conditional mean error goes to zero \( (E(e|X,F) = 0) \).

Then we can write the gender difference in average salaries, adding and subtracting the counterfactual average salary that women would have earned at the male returns, \( \bar{X}_f \bar{\beta}_m \),

\[
\bar{Salary}_m - \bar{Salary}_f = \bar{X}_m \bar{\beta}_m - \bar{X}_f \bar{\beta}_f + \bar{X}_f \bar{\beta}_m - \bar{X}_m \bar{\beta}_m
\]

\[
= (\bar{X}_m - \bar{X}_f)\bar{\beta}_m + (\bar{\beta}_m - \bar{\beta}_f)\bar{X}_f
\]

(2)

where the first term in the last equality captures the impact on the gender salary gap of differences in the average characteristics of men and women, \( (\bar{X}_m - \bar{X}_f) \), evaluated at the male returns, \( \bar{\beta}_m \), and the second term measure differences due to differential returns, sometimes called the unexplained part, sometimes called the part due to discrimination.

This decomposition could have used as alternative counterfactual average salary, the average salary that men would have earned at the female returns, \( \bar{X}_m \bar{\beta}_f \), in which case equation (2) would be written as:

\[
\bar{Salary}_m - \bar{Salary}_f = (\bar{X}_m - \bar{X}_f)\bar{\beta}_f + (\bar{\beta}_f - \bar{\beta}_m)\bar{X}_m
\]

(3)

where the first term now captures the impact on the gender salary gap of differences in the average characteristics of men and women evaluated at the female returns. Because they are based on different counterfactuals and evaluate the impact of gender differences in characteristics using potentially different returns, the male or the female returns, the results of the decompositions using equation (2) and (3) can be different. For example, when female returns to characteristics are lower than male returns, the part explained by characteristics will be smaller and the part unexplained will be larger.

Another alternative takes equation (1) as the correct specification, assuming that the female dummy essentially captures the discriminatory components of the salary structure and thus the returns to characteristics in this equation represent the non-discriminatory salary structure. It is implemented by constructing two counterfactual average salaries, the average salary that women would have earned at the pooled returns, \( \bar{X}_f \bar{\beta} \), and the average salary that men would have earned at the pooled returns, \( \bar{X}_m \bar{\beta} \), the decomposition is then written as

\[
\bar{Salary}_m - \bar{Salary}_f = (\bar{X}_m - \bar{X}_f)\bar{\beta} + [\bar{X}_m (\bar{\beta}_f - \bar{\beta}) - \bar{X}_f (\bar{\beta}_f - \bar{\beta})]
\]

(4)

where the first term captures the impact on the gender salary gap of differences in the average characteristics of men and women, evaluated at the pooled returns, and where the last term in bracket will correspond to the parameter \( \alpha \) of equation (1). The sub-components of this last term can be interpreted as the advantage of men, \( \bar{X}_m (\bar{\beta}_f - \bar{\beta}) \), and the disadvantage of women, \( \bar{X}_f (\bar{\beta}_f - \bar{\beta}) \). The decomposition (4) provides an interpretation of equation (1) based on counterfactual average salaries.
C. Results

We provide estimation results using all four equations introduced above. We begin by providing a summary table of the various analyses conducted using the above four methodologies, plus additional regressions using the logarithm of annual salary [log(salary)] as the dependent variable.

| Method                                      | Equation | Gender Effect | Std. Err. | t-stat | P>|t| | % of UBC Average Salary |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|--------|-----|------------------------|
| OLS -Dummy for Gender (Specification 1)     | (1)      | -374.79       | 1029.92   | -0.4   | 0.72 | -0.002                 |
| OLS -Dummy for Gender (Specification 2)     | (1)      | 53.26         | 911.61    | 0.06   | 0.95 | 0.0003                 |
| OLS -Dummy for Gender on Ln(Salaries) (Specification 1) | (1) | -0.0018       | 0.0056    | -0.33  | 0.74 | 0.000                   |
| OLS -Dummy for Gender on Ln(Salaries) (Specification 2) | (1) | 0.0004        | 0.0051    | 0.08   | 0.94 | 0.000                   |
| Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition Pooled Coefficients with Gender Dummy (Specification 1) | (4) | -374.79       | 954.64    | -0.39  | 0.70 | -0.002                 |
| Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition Male Coefficients (Specification 1) | (2) | -571.01       | 1344.23   | -0.42  | 0.67 | -0.003                 |
| Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition Female Coefficients (Specification 1) | (3) | -1714.35      | 1309.64   | -1.31  | 0.19 | -0.010                 |

Note: In Specification 1, the explanatory variables are professorial ranks, distinguished chairs, number of years in professorial ranks, and administrative units. Specification 2 adds type of appointment, numbers of years in executive positions, starting rank at appointment.

All methodologies find a non-statistically significant female salary disadvantage ranging from a negative -1714.35 to a positive 53.26 with large standard errors. These female penalties and premiums are not statistically different from zero at the 5% or 10% level, and from each other. These results stand in sharp contrast to the 2010 analysis where all four equations estimated a statistically significant female penalty of about 2%. Here, the estimation on log salary yields what is called a “clean zero”, that is not only an estimate that is not statistically significant but a point estimate that is close to zero. The dummy variable method yields a positive point estimates, although not statistically significant, with Specification 2. This is consistent with the fact that introducing more controls, especially for experience, generally reduces
the female penalty which makes Specification 1 more conservative. For the three Oaxaca-Blinder decompositions, only the results from Specification 1 are presented to preserve space.

Table 4 and 5 give more details about the estimation results for both Specifications, but does not report the Departmental dummies to preserve space. Table 4 reports the results of the estimation of equation (1) which is performed on the pooled sample (men and women together) by Ordinary Least Squares. The coefficient of the female dummy (Gender) provides an estimate of the gender differences in salaries not accounted for by the explanatory variables. Columns (1) and (3) use the more parsimonious Specification (1), while columns (2) and (4) include a more extensive set of explanatory variables of Specification (2). Columns (1) and (2) use the Current Salary as dependent variable, and Column (3) and (4) use the natural logarithm of Current Salary. The table reports the estimated coefficients of the regression and the standard errors of the coefficients underneath. In addition, statistical significance is indicated with the usual star system indicated at the bottom of the table. Although not reported in the Table, Departmental dummies are included in all regressions.

Note that the measures of the correlation between the actual and predicted salaries, the adjusted R-squares, are relatively high for cross-sectional data, ranging from 79% to 84%, and show that the specifications are very successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient (std. err.)</th>
<th>Coefficient (std. err.)</th>
<th>Coefficient (std. err.)</th>
<th>Coefficient (std. err.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-374.785 (1029.92)</td>
<td>53.259 (911.61)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.006)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>70486.871*** (9781.59)</td>
<td>64382.603*** (9890.02)</td>
<td>0.512*** (0.091)</td>
<td>0.502*** (0.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC</td>
<td>36027.019*** (9769.39)</td>
<td>34138.511*** (9828.66)</td>
<td>0.310*** (0.091)</td>
<td>0.321*** (0.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASST</td>
<td>11475.927 (9797.48)</td>
<td>8597.773 (9473.64)</td>
<td>0.139 (0.092)</td>
<td>0.119 (0.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFTeach</td>
<td>41826.260*** (10189.51)</td>
<td>39667.614*** (10085.15)</td>
<td>0.341*** (0.093)</td>
<td>0.375*** (0.085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrINSTR</td>
<td>16033.713 (9858.10)</td>
<td>16471.305 (9858.21)</td>
<td>0.159 (0.092)</td>
<td>0.202* (0.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIL</td>
<td>34678.705*** (6368.28)</td>
<td>26842.988*** (7933.23)</td>
<td>0.178*** (0.029)</td>
<td>0.141*** (0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC1</td>
<td>32587.765*** (4198.35)</td>
<td>32712.696*** (4681.33)</td>
<td>0.156*** (0.018)</td>
<td>0.158*** (0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC2</td>
<td>10640.735*** (1925.63)</td>
<td>10472.209*** (2017.27)</td>
<td>0.066*** (0.011)</td>
<td>0.066*** (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUS</td>
<td>21687.677*** (4079.99)</td>
<td>23849.015*** (4146.55)</td>
<td>0.109*** (0.020)</td>
<td>0.117*** (0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDUS</td>
<td>17738.036** (6537.30)</td>
<td>16785.043* (7539.25)</td>
<td>0.095** (0.032)</td>
<td>0.090* (0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>T-value</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsRank</td>
<td>2882.781***</td>
<td>(267.79)</td>
<td>2882.781***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(234.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsRank2</td>
<td>-94.516***</td>
<td>(11.58)</td>
<td>-94.516***</td>
<td>-0.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-10.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUC</td>
<td>-14264.306***</td>
<td>(2204.95)</td>
<td>-14264.306***</td>
<td>-0.084***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2410.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsSrEx</td>
<td>4624.424***</td>
<td>(1018.03)</td>
<td>4624.424***</td>
<td>0.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1004.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsMidEx</td>
<td>1931.741***</td>
<td>(404.20)</td>
<td>1931.741***</td>
<td>0.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(400.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsOthEx</td>
<td>983.211</td>
<td>(513.92)</td>
<td>983.211</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(503.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsJrEx</td>
<td>1911.005***</td>
<td>(424.24)</td>
<td>1911.005***</td>
<td>0.011***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(420.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StInst</td>
<td>-4626.904</td>
<td>(4555.20)</td>
<td>-4626.904</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4555.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StSrInst</td>
<td>4372.353</td>
<td>(6612.38)</td>
<td>4372.353</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6562.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StAssoc</td>
<td>-1893.732</td>
<td>(1539.16)</td>
<td>-1893.732</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1509.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StFull</td>
<td>9435.376***</td>
<td>(2821.66)</td>
<td>9435.376***</td>
<td>0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2812.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department Dummies** included but not reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisks indicate statistical significance, *** at 1% level, ** at 5% level and * at 10% level.

As indicated earlier, when the more detailed measures of experience including type of appointment, numbers of years in executive positions, starting rank at appointment are added as controls in columns (2) and (4), the gender coefficient becomes positive although not statistically significant. Among these variables, starting as Full Professor (StFull), and the number of years in Senior executive positions (YrsSrEx) are the ones that have the most significance and impact. The results confirm the relative importance of the under-representation of women at higher ranks among the most critical explanatory factors for gender differences in professorial salaries. But this also raises questions about their exogeneity (or disassociation with any discriminatory process) with respect to salaries of these additional variables, another reason why Specification (1) is more conservative.

Table 5 reports the results of the Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition corresponding to the different counterfactual experiments described in equation (2), (3) and (4) using Specification (1). The unexplained part of the gender salary differential is not statistically significant whatever the alternative choices of counterfactual. The decomposition results in the first column of Table 5 follow the

---

3 The estimations were performed using the STATA software, and the “Oaxaca” procedure coded by Jahn (2008).
specification of column (1) from Table 4, therefore the unexplained part from the pooled regression is equal to the coefficient of gender from the preceding table. Professorial rank remains the most important explanatory factor, whose explanatory power accounts for 55-58% of the gender salary gap. It is followed by Departmental indicator variables which explain from 20% to 25% of the salary gap. Using the pooled coefficients, the explanatory factors account for almost all of the gap 97.6%.

Table 5. Oaxaca-Blinder Decompositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients of Counterfactual Salaries:</th>
<th>Pooled\textsuperscript{a} Coeff.</th>
<th>% of gap</th>
<th>Male Coeff.</th>
<th>% of gap</th>
<th>Female Coeff.</th>
<th>% of gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Gender Salary Differentials</td>
<td>15412.44 ***</td>
<td>15412.44 ***</td>
<td>15412.44 ***</td>
<td>15412.44 ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounted for by differences in characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>8867.35 ***</td>
<td>57.53%</td>
<td>8988.05 ***</td>
<td>58.32%</td>
<td>8496.08 ***</td>
<td>55.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>729.75 *</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>700.41</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>1381.06</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Rank</td>
<td>1541.71 **</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>1832.10</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>724.82 *</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Dummies</td>
<td>3898.85 ***</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
<td>3320.88 **</td>
<td>21.55%</td>
<td>3096.13 *</td>
<td>20.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Explained</td>
<td>15037.66 ***</td>
<td>97.57%</td>
<td>14841.43 ***</td>
<td>96.30%</td>
<td>13698.09 ***</td>
<td>88.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unexplained</td>
<td>374.79 *</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>571.01</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1714.35</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Pooled Coefficients with Gender Dummy

Asterisks indicate statistical significance, \*** at 1\% level, \** at 5\% level and \* at 10\% level.

The fact that the different choices of reference wage structure yield different size results indicates that there are aspects of the wage structure, as indicated by differences in the explanatory power of years in rank which may deserve more attention. Nevertheless, there is a substantial reduction in the unexplained gender gap, which was found to be around 20\% in 2010, now it ranges from 2.4\% to 11\% depending on the reference wage structure. But it is not found to be statistically significant as also indicated in Table 3.

D. Conclusions

The current analysis revisits gender differences in professorial salaries at UBC with a different sample that includes faculty members for UBC-Okanagan and faculty members in the Educational Leadership stream focusing on members that were hired prior the 2012 pay equity adjustment. This sample was selected for analysis because this constituency was included in the pay adjustment; the BCHRT’s approval requires UBC to report on the effectiveness of the 2\% salary adjustment to the base salaries of all female full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members, effective as of July 1, 2010, in ameliorating the pay gap. The main finding of the analysis is the previous gender penalty of about 2\% has not reappeared. Indeed, among this group of faculty members, it is fair to say that no statistically significant gender penalty can be found.
Executive Summary
This Employment Systems Review (ESR) is part of a process by the University of British Columbia (UBC) to update its 2010 Employment Equity Plan and to create the 2019 Inclusion Action Plan. An ESR examines current employment policies related to recruitment and selection; training and development; promotion and tenure; awards, recognition and retention; and termination and retirement, to identify barriers to success for those covered by the British Columbia Human Rights Code and designated equity groups. The designated equity groups included in Policy #2: Employment Equity mirror those in the Employment Equity Act and include women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities. In addition, UBC also collects data on sexual/gender diversity. This ESR explores initiatives currently underway across UBC that are working to increase employment equity for the designated equity groups and those identifying as a sexual or gender minority.

The scope of this review includes:

1. examining equity-related data for trends in workforce patterns, and in the workplace experiences of faculty and staff;
2. identifying practices which may create barriers to inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
3. identifying practices which may create increased access to inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
4. consulting with key stakeholders to learn from their experiences of policy implementation; and,
5. developing recommendations for UBC’s Employment Equity Plan (EEP).
The UBC data for this report comes from three main sources:

1. UBC’s human resources database, which records sex;
2. responses to UBC’s employment equity survey (U Count at UBC); and
3. the Workplace Experiences Survey (WES), conducted every three years, which includes demographic data and workplace engagement measures.

Findings

Efforts at UBC to increase equity and diversity among faculty and staff are having some success. UBC’s data collection and analysis initiatives are allowing greater examination of the experiences of faculty and staff. When these experiences are mapped onto the employment systems, opportunities to increase equity and inclusion become more evident.

Throughout the discussion of employment systems in this report, initiatives that have worked are highlighted, and can be amplified in system change efforts. The report also highlights gaps, barriers, and areas where this work can be advanced to ensure that UBC is meeting its aspirations to be the more inclusive institution described in Shaping UBC’s Next Century—the strategic plan of the University of British Columbia (UBC).

Recommendations

Proposed recommendations for each of the levels of the employment system are detailed throughout the review. The following overarching recommendations address the strengths of UBC: its ability to critically analyze and create new knowledge; its decentralized structure, relying on Faculties and Units to reflect on their best work; and its centralized advisory units to provide support to system-wide change initiatives.

1. UBC has a strong workforce with many faculty and staff with expertise and curiosity about how to make workplaces more inclusive and/or who are already testing various ideas. Piloting initiatives that can make changes at the individual, unit, and system level, critically and rigorously evaluating them, recognizing promising efforts, and developing new knowledge in this area to share is part of the university mission. We propose to develop an Employment Equity Plan that can be an institutional applied research project exploring promising practices to create more inclusion and equity in a research university, and acting as a model for wider society: include funding for pilots, research, validating accountability measures, communications, etc.

2. Ensure administrative heads of units are required to evaluate inclusion as a regular and frequent part of management reporting, supported by new capacities to provide data-driven decision-making at the unit level and supporting those in leadership roles to review and plan for improvements.

3. Develop, communicate, test, and refine a foundational strengths and skills framework for engaging diversity constructively, accompanied by a modular training program promoted for all employees at UBC.

4. Develop and implement an institutional policy for accommodations to more effectively include people with disabilities in the workplace.

5. Ensure central support units have clear mandates, responsibilities, accountabilities, and resources to support continuous improvement to systems changes as they relate to creating a more diverse and inclusive workplace.

Faculty and staff participants in the consultations for this review expressed their belief that significant steps have been made in creating a more inclusive workplace and that with continued strong and visible support from senior leadership much more was possible.
Next Steps

The Employment Systems Review is the first step and provides the foundation for updating UBC’s existing Employment Equity Plan which will be completed in February. In addition, currently, the Equity & Inclusion Office has been working with the Inclusion Working Group to determine institutional goals to operationalize the strategic commitment to inclusion. Recommendations within the ESR will be mapped to the institutional goals and feedback on these actions (and others) will be sought through a community consultation process, scheduled to begin in February. A final draft of UBC’s Inclusion Action Plan will be presented to Board in September 2019.
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STRATEGIC CORE AREAS SUPPORTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✔ People and Places</th>
<th>☐ Research Excellence</th>
<th>☐ Transformative Learning</th>
<th>☐ Local / Global Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

DESCRIPTION & RATIONALE

This Employment Systems Review, and the Employment Equity Plan and Inclusion Action Plan that will be developed from it, continue UBC’s hard work to advance employment equity and inclusion across the university, and to demonstrate its leadership in this respect in the community and wider society.

BENEFITS

Learning, Research, Financial, Sustainability & Reputational

Workforce diversity and engagement lead to better decision-making and to greater engagement in the workplace, as evidenced by the studies referenced in the Review. UBC has an opportunity to develop new learning in this area through applied research, and to increase its reputation as a leader in equity and inclusion across Canada and North America.

RISKS

Financial, Operational & Reputational

An open and frank discussion of the areas where UBC could be more supportive of diversity and employment equity may be a risk to its reputation and may be used in cases brought before the BC Human Rights Tribunal; however, this risk is balanced by UBC’s commitment to ameliorating barriers identified and advancing employment equity through its Employment Equity Plan and Inclusion Action Plan.

SCHEDULE

Implementation Timeline

February – June 2019: consultations begin regarding the Inclusion Action Plan, based on the ESR and updated EEP to initial consultation participants and to the wider campuses.

September 2019: Presentation of Inclusion Action Plan to the Board, with clarity about how its implementation supports and is aligned with to the recommendations in this review.

CONSULTATION

Relevant Units, Internal & External Constituencies

This ESR was developed through consultations with approximately 100 stakeholders across both campuses, including Human Resources, faculty members, staff members, and employee associations and union groups.

Previous Report Date

November 1990 UBC Employment Systems Review, followed by annual Employment Equity Reports.

Decision

Development of an Employment Equity Plan to comply with Employment Equity Act and Federal Contractors’ Program

Action / Follow Up

Plan developed and action items implemented over time.

1 UBC is in the process of updating its Human Resources Management System to provide the option for more choices than male/female in the personnel records of employees.
Executive Summary

This Employment Systems Review (ESR) is part of a process by the University of British Columbia (UBC) to update its 2010 Employment Equity Plan and to create the 2019 Inclusion Action Plan1. An ESR examines current employment policies related to recruitment and selection; training and development; promotion and tenure; awards, recognition and retention; and termination and retirement, to identify barriers to success for those covered by the British Columbia Human Rights Code and designated equity groups. The designated equity groups included in Policy #2: Employment Equity mirror those in the Employment Equity Act and include women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities. In addition, UBC also collects data on sexual/gender diversity. This ESR explores initiatives currently underway across UBC that are working to increase employment equity for the designated equity groups and those identifying as a sexual or gender minority.

The scope of this review includes:
1. examining equity-related data for trends in workforce patterns, and in the workplace experiences of faculty and staff;
2. identifying practices which may create barriers to inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
3. identifying practices which may create increased access to inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
4. consulting with key stakeholders to learn from their experiences of policy implementation; and,
5. developing recommendations for UBC’s Employment Equity Plan (EEP).

The UBC data for this report comes from three main sources:
1. UBC’s human resources database, which records sex2;
2. responses to UBC’s employment equity survey (U Count at UBC); and
3. the Workplace Experiences Survey (WES), conducted every three years, which includes demographic data and workplace engagement measures.

Findings

Efforts at UBC to increase equity and diversity among faculty and staff are having some success, however as research by Henry et al (2017) notes, those changes can be experienced differentially among designated equity groups3. UBC’s data collection and analysis initiatives are allowing greater examination of these differential impacts, often at the

---

1 Throughout this review, a number of publications, articles and references are cited. There is a significant body of research, discussion and publications relating to employment equity, diversity and inclusion. The references in this review are illustrative only and are not a comprehensive review of this area.
2 UBC is in the process of updating its Human Resources Management System to provide the option for more choices than male/female in the personnel records of employees.
3 Frances Henry, Enakshi Dua, Carl E. James, Audrey Kobayashi, Peter Li, Howard Ramos, and Malinda S. Smith, 2017, The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities, UBC Press.
faculties/departments/units. When these effects are mapped onto the employment systems, opportunities to increase equity and inclusion become more evident. To capitalize on these opportunities, it is necessary to look at the system as self-reinforcing and determine where structures, strategies, and competencies can be shifted or interrupted to increase diversity and inclusion.

UBC faculty, staff, and students have been working on increasing diversity and inclusion since 1990, when the first ESR was completed. This has been demonstrated by gains in hiring; changes in training and conversations regarding differences, including the concerns raised by members of designated equity groups; and enthusiasm and curiosity about how to do the work of equity and inclusion within the workplace. Throughout the discussion of employment systems in this report, initiatives that have worked are highlighted, and can be amplified in system change efforts. The report also highlights gaps, barriers, and areas where this work can be advanced to ensure that UBC is meeting its aspirations to be the more inclusive institution described in *Shaping UBC’s Next Century*—the strategic plan of the University of British Columbia (UBC).

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for each of the levels of the employment system are detailed throughout the review. The following overarching recommendations address the strengths of UBC: its ability to critically analyze and create new knowledge; its decentralized structure, relying on Faculties and Units to reflect on their best work; and its centralized advisory units to provide support to system-wide change initiatives.

1. **UBC has a strong workforce with many faculty and staff with expertise and curiosity about how to make workplaces more inclusive and/or who are already testing various ideas.** Piloting initiatives that can make changes at the individual, unit, and system level, critically and rigorously evaluating them, recognizing promising efforts, and developing new knowledge in this area to share is part of the university mission. We should develop an Employment Equity Plan that can be an institutional applied research project exploring promising practices to create more inclusion and equity in a research university, and acting as a model for wider society: include funding for pilots, research, validating accountability measures, communications, etc.

2. **Ensure administrative heads of units are required to evaluate inclusion as a regular and frequent part of management reporting, supported by new capacities to provide data-driven decision-making at the unit level and supporting those in leadership roles to review and plan for improvements.**

3. **Develop, communicate, test, and refine a foundational strengths and skills framework for engaging diversity constructively, accompanied by a modular training program promoted for all employees at UBC.**
4. Develop and implement an institutional policy for accommodations to more effectively include people with disabilities in the workplace.

5. Ensure central support units have clear mandates, responsibilities, accountabilities, and resources to support continuous improvement to systems changes as they relate to creating a more diverse and inclusive workplace.

Faculty and staff participants in the consultations for this review expressed their belief that significant steps have been made in creating a more inclusive workplace and that with continued strong and visible support from senior leadership much more was possible.
Many UBC staff and faculty members generously contributed their thoughts, experiences and expertise to this Employment Systems Review, and their hopes for increasing equity and inclusion at UBC. We would like to thank you for your generosity and careful attention to the questions raised in our discussions. We would also like to thank those who efficiently set up all the meetings across UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan – your kindness is greatly appreciated. In addition, PAIR and UBC HR teams have been instrumental and essential to completing this review and fulfilling myriad requests for data, clarification, advice, and ideas. We are very grateful for their patience and their expertise.
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Employment Systems Review Context

This Employment Systems Review (ESR) is part of a process by the University of British Columbia (UBC) to update its 2010 Employment Equity Plan and build the foundation for its Inclusion Action Plan. An updated Employment Equity Plan and Inclusion Action Plan will align and support *Shaping UBC’s Next Century, the strategic plan of UBC*, and the draft *Indigenous Strategic Plan*. One of the goals of the Shaping UBC’s Next Century is to:

*Build a diverse culture that integrates our themes of innovation, collaboration and inclusion, and infuses them through all our activities.*

Current research by Rock & Grant (2016) and Phillips et al (2008) has demonstrated that an inclusive workplace with diverse teams creates better decisions and more innovative work. This is true for academia as well as business and public service. UBC has made a firm commitment to increasing equity and inclusion in the classroom, workplace and campus as part of its quest for excellence.

As such, an ESR can help to highlight policy and practices that are enhancing, as well as hindering, an inclusive workplace. An ESR examines current employment policies related to recruitment and selection; training and development; promotion and tenure; awards, recognition and retention; and termination and retirement, for adverse effects on designated equity groups. The designated equity groups included in the Employment Equity Act and include women, members of visible minorities, Aboriginal peoples, and persons with disabilities. In addition, UBC also collects data on sexual/gender diversity. This ESR also explores initiatives currently underway across UBC that are successful in increasing employment equity and inclusion.

Diversity is a fact of human experience. At UBC we are committed to creating an inclusive workplace for all: facilitating representation of members of designated equity groups is part of that. However, employing people from the five designated equity groups does not necessarily lead to inclusion and honouring of different experiences. The measure of inclusion is attitude and behaviour. For instance, Donais (2014) notes that behaviour which could be experienced

---


8 UBC’s *Policy #3: Harassment & Discrimination* provides protection from discrimination for the protected grounds as enumerated in *British Columbia’s Human Rights Code*. 
as discriminatory or exclusionary in the workplace can lead to disillusionment and disengagement\(^9\).

To sustain an institution that generates new knowledge, continues to develop critical thinking skills for a global world, and advances rigorous understandings of the best ways to support learning for UBC’s student population, UBC needs not only increased diversity, but also intentional inclusion across a wide range of its activities. Galinsky et al (2015) have found that workplaces that attempt to include many cultures, recognize varied learning styles, and respect the lived experiences of their communities, require deliberate policies and strategies to create innovation and excellence\(^{10}\).

**Scope**

UBC is a very large institution: it spans two campuses, employs over 10,000 staff, 5,500 faculty, and more than 60,000 undergraduate and graduate students. While employment systems are most often experienced at the level of the Unit, Department, or Faculty, UBC is a single employer with respect to its commitments and obligations to employment equity.

The scope of this review includes:

1. examining equity-related data for trends in workforce patterns, and in the workplace experiences of faculty and staff;
2. identifying practices which may create barriers to inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
3. identifying practices which have been successful in increasing inclusive employment and workplaces for designated equity groups within the university;
4. consulting with key stakeholders to learn from their experiences of policy implementation; and,
5. developing recommendations for UBC’s Employment Equity Plan (EEP).

Key stakeholders include: Human Resources and other central support unit leadership; Faculty Equity Leads and other faculty leaders; representatives of designated equity groups; and unions, professional associations, and faculty and employee groups. A list of stakeholders consulted is included in Appendix A to this report.

**Equity-Related Data**

The UBC statistical data for this report comes from three main sources:

---


\(^{10}\) Adam D. Galinsky et al, 2015, *Maximizing the Gains and Minimizing the Pains of Diversity: A Policy Perspective*, APS, Perspectives on Psychological Science, Vol. 10(6) 742 –748

1. UBC’s human resources database, which records sex\textsuperscript{11};
2. responses to UBC’s employment equity survey (U Count at UBC); and
3. the Workplace Experiences Survey (WES), conducted every three years, which includes demographic data and workplace engagement measures.

In both surveys, respondents can decline to answer any of the demographic questions. The employment equity data provides quantitative information about representation by Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOG), while the WES provides both quantitative and qualitative information about staff experiences and engagement within the workplace.

The data sets from these two surveys cover different timeframes: data collection for the EES is ongoing, and data is downloaded in October each year; the WES took place in November 2017. For those reasons, the analysis reports on patterns in the data over time, rather than at only one point in time. More information about data collection, analysis and regular reporting is available in Appendix B of this report.

Validity of the Data

Self-identification is the underlying principle of both surveys, and sample sizes mean statistical significance tests are not possible\textsuperscript{12}. If employees choose not to self-identify for any reason, their equity data is not reflected in the results. The one exception to this is sex (male/female): it is a required feature of the health insurance benefit and is part of the employment record, so all employees are reflected in the employment equity reports for this variable. In the WES, sex is based on self-reports. In both the EES and WES surveys, self-identification provides the results for other designated equity seeking groups: Aboriginal peoples, members of visible minorities, persons with disabilities, and minority sexual orientations/gender identities. This latter category combines data for those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans*, transsexual, intersex, asexual, + (any analogous term from the past, present, and/or future).

Employees who fear discrimination in the workplace may be uncomfortable with disclosure. It may also be that there are people who do not feel these surveys create change and therefore do not see the point of participating, or that people are happy with UBC and its workplace practices. There is no way to tell. Other factors may also constrain participation; trends in representation over time may indicate changes in individual’s perceptions of the risks of self-identifying as much as they do changes in actual representation of that population at UBC.

\textsuperscript{11} UBC is in the process of updating its Human Resources Management System to provide the option for more choices than male/female in the personnel records of employees.

\textsuperscript{12} Self-selection bias is a concern with both surveys, and small sample sizes mean statistical significance tests are not possible. Self-identification of women and men in the employment equity survey can be compared to the human resources database to see if the bias in the responses is statistically significant. However, for other FCP designated equity groups, the only objective external measure provided for comparative purposes is the 2011 Canadian Available Workforce data provided based on the 2011 Canadian Household Census. That census had a revised non-mandatory sampling method which may have introduced response biases as well.
Response rates for both surveys have been trending higher. In keeping with UBC’s Employment Equity Reports, where fewer than five respondents exist, data is not reported to protect privacy.13

**Employment Equity Survey**

*Figure 1: Employment Equity Survey Response Rates: UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan*

For the 2017/2018 academic year, 8,903 UBCV faculty and staff responded to the equity survey, and at UBCO, 866 faculty and staff responded. A census of the workforce was conducted in 2016 which explains the ‘bump’ in response rates between 2015 and 2016.

The purpose of the employment equity survey is to inform equity and inclusion programming across UBC through better understanding the demographics of UBC’s faculty and staff, and to fulfill federal and provincial reporting requirements on employment equity. Beyond simple representation, UBC is continuing to develop equity-related data dashboards that reflect trends in hiring, salaries, promotions, and exits across faculties and units.

**Workplace Experiences Survey**

The Workplace Experiences Survey has been conducted regularly since 2009. Participation has been steadily increasing. In the autumn of 2017, over 6,000 faculty and staff participated across both campuses. Almost half (47%) of UBC’s staff participated in the survey, and 27% of faculty members.

---

13 The University of British Columbia, Employment Equity Report 2016, p. 46

The purpose of the WES is to measure the engagement of faculty\textsuperscript{14} and staff\textsuperscript{15}. Engagement affects employees' initiative and willingness to provide discretionary effort, ability to do their best work, and contributions to the overall success of UBC. Drivers of engagement at UBC are Professional Growth, UBC’s Senior Leadership, Inclusion & Respect, and Student Focus. The order of the last three changes somewhat when responses are disaggregated for faculty and staff.

Data from the survey indicates that opportunities to enhance engagement exist within UBC’s employment systems by further clarifying policies and practices that enhance equitable professional growth; by enhanced support for inclusive and respectful workplaces; and by continuing to honour the commitments of UBC’s leadership through hiring, training, and promotions.

Consultations with faculty and staff from both campuses provided experiential perspectives on UBC’s employment systems. People have been exceptionally generous with their time, experiences, analysis and enthusiasm. Respectfully representing diverse perspectives while working to achieve the aims of the ESR can create tensions. Making choices about what is most relevant may mean not sharing various lived experiences that are not as directly influenced by employment systems, and this can feel like people’s voices were not heard. Reporting on the many positive efforts to create inclusion also necessitates discussing systemic inertia where those changes may not have been integrated. Celebrating the successes that exist must be balanced by presenting both the quantitative and qualitative evidence of continuing barriers to full inclusion.

In the consultation meetings for the ESR, faculty and staff participants expressed their belief that even with UBC’s very decentralized management structure, creating a more inclusive workplace was happening and could be enhanced through strong, visible, and sustained support from senior leadership. Participants wish to see more communications, resources, and accountability measures that support inclusion as a strategic and institutional priority.

This report is intended to continue and enhance the dialogue about creating inclusion at UBC and to begin the process of updating the EEP. Consultations will continue to inform the EEP and an institutional Inclusion Action Plan.

\textsuperscript{14}Talent Map, February 2018, \textit{UBC Overall Results, 2017 WES Survey}, Slide 24, \url{http://focusonpeople.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2018/02/UBC-WES-2017-Overall-Results.pdf}

\textsuperscript{15}Talent Map, February 2018, \textit{UBC Overall Results, 2017 WES Survey}, Slide 33, \url{http://focusonpeople.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2018/02/UBC-WES-2017-Overall-Results.pdf}
Trends in Currently Available Employment Equity and WES Data

The data included in this ESR, disaggregated by each of the five designated equity groups, is intended to provide a backdrop for the examination of employment systems across UBC\(^{16}\). Where possible, the most recently published data from the University of Toronto\(^{17}\), McGill University\(^{18}\), and the University of Alberta\(^{19}\) provides additional context from comparable Canadian research universities.

For consistency, the terminology used when reporting employment equity statistics reflects the terminology in the Federal Contractors Program, the Employment Equity Survey, and UBC’s Policy #2: Employment Equity. The federal government uses Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs)\(^{20}\), to reflect the national workforce. A copy of the EEOG table, including representative employee categories for UBC, is attached in Appendix B. The WES data is reported using more current terminology and is categorized in various ways to more clearly reflect the workforce in the university.

Aboriginal Staff & Faculty

Figure 2: Aboriginal Peoples: Comparative Representation at Canadian Research Universities

Across all EEOGs, in 2017 self-reported Aboriginal Peoples make up 2.35% of the workforce at UBC: below the 2011 Canadian workforce availability of 3.5%. Representation is increasing

---

\(^{16}\) The data for overall trends in representation was downloaded on October 31, 2017, and the data regarding faculty trends in representation, salary equity and time to first and second promotion (where available) was accurate as of May 16, 2018. It reflects the combined workforces of UBCV and UBCO.


slightly, and is higher than that at each of the University of Alberta (UofA), McGill University (McGill), and the University of Toronto\textsuperscript{21} (UofT).

Figure 3: Aboriginal Peoples – 25-Year Trends in Active Tenure Stream Faculty

Self-reported Aboriginal representation among tenure stream faculty has been constant over the last ten years. At 1.6%, it is higher than at three comparable Canadian research universities, and slightly higher than the University Teachers EEOG Canadian availability at 1.3%.

Self-reported Aboriginal representation among the staff workforce is low at UBC, except in the EEOG\textsuperscript{22} of Professionals and Skilled Sales & Service.

Trends in the WES data help to indicate where employment systems may be able to support greater engagement and inclusion. Those who self-identified as Indigenous generally scored their workplace experiences lower across most categories of the WES than those who did not self-identify as Indigenous.

People who self-identified as Indigenous in the WES had very similar engagement scores in 2017 and 2014. Scores were more positive than in 2014 in the leadership categories. Positive trends of particular note were in opportunities to learn and grow professionally, and in feeling part of a community at UBC. Areas of concern for people who self-identified as Indigenous included not seeing links between their work and UBC’s long-term objectives, dissatisfaction with their current role, and slightly lower scores compared to 2014 regarding people treating each other with respect and consideration in the workplace. Being proud to tell others about working at UBC and recommending UBC to a friend as a great place to work both had lower scores in 2017 than in 2014.

\textsuperscript{22} Page 2, Appendix B to this report has an explanation of these categories and their corresponding positions at UBC.
Figure 5: Comparative Salary Data: Aboriginal Peoples and Gender

It is difficult to interpret the data in the table above because of the small proportion of Aboriginal faculty and staff at UBC. Small sample size means that one or two highly paid (or lowly paid) Aboriginal staff or faculty can easily skew the information. It appears that there is an inverse relationship between representation and salary for women staff and faculty self-identifying as Aboriginal, however given the low representation of women in general and female Aboriginal staff or faculty in particular, this interpretation may be unreliable.

Male staff and faculty self-identifying as Aboriginal have higher representation compared to Aboriginal women in the $100,000+ salary ranges. The pattern of salary ranges across Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal men are similar except in the $50,000-$74,999 range, where there are more Aboriginal men compared to Aboriginal women – the opposite applies for non-Aboriginal men and women. Self-identified Aboriginal peoples at UBC have lower representation at higher salary ranges compared to their non-Aboriginal counterparts.

**Findings:** Based on the trends in both representation and workplace experience data, expanding the hiring and retention of Aboriginal Peoples overall at UBC to match levels reported in the 2011 Canadian workforce data faces some barriers. Salary range data across the 2016-17 year depicts differences that may be due to the small sample size of those self-identifying as Aboriginal Peoples, and requires further exploration. People who participated in the consultation provided some suggestions and these are included in discussions within the relevant employment system.

---

23 The data in this chart was downloaded October 15, 2016. There were 7,855 women and 6,103 men working at UBC on that date. Of them, 140 women and 67 men self-identified as Aboriginal peoples.
Staff & Faculty with Disabilities

Figure 6: Persons with Disabilities: Comparative Representation at Canadian Research Universities

Across all EEOGs, self-identified persons with disabilities make up 3.9% of UBC’s workforce, lower than the 2011 Canadian workforce availability of 4.9%. UBC’s workforce has higher representation of self-identified persons with disabilities than UofA or McGill, but less than half the self-identified representation among faculty and staff at UofT.

It may be that UofT’s greater representation among faculty from people with disabilities is because the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act creates established standards for accommodation that have made people more confident to self-identify. It may also be that there are more institutes of higher education within a smaller geographical area: this provides possibilities for training at different schools for PhD, post-doc and tenure-stream positions while maintaining existing support systems outside of the institution.

The employment equity data is often contested for this designated equity group. There are concerns that people may not self-identify because:

- they do not see themselves in the definition of disability;
- they are worried that it will have an effect on their professional growth and so do not disclose invisible disabilities;
- disabilities often occur later in life, and people may not update their responses in subsequent employment equity surveys.

However, these reasons for not self-reporting do not fully explain why the self-reported numbers were higher in the past, but have dropped off consistently in 12 of the 15 EEOG categories, and are below the 2011 Canadian workforce availability statistics.
Representation of self-reported persons with disabilities is declining as a percentage of the total workforce across all EEOGs at UBC except University Teachers and Skilled Sales & Service.

Figure 7: 25-Year Trends in Faculty Self-Identifying as Persons with Disabilities

The downward trend over the last 25 years in faculty self-identifying with a disability exists in both the research and teaching tenure streams.

_Persons with Disabilities in the WES_

In 2017, tenure-track faculty self-identifying with a disability had consistently and significantly higher WES scores on tenure-specific questions overall than in 2014, though scores for the process for earning tenure or promotion remain the same.

For UBC overall, faculty and staff who self-identified as having a disability had lower engagement scores in 2017. A disproportionate number of disabled faculty and staff report that they did not see a clear link between their work and UBC’s long-term objectives, and indicated a reluctance to recommend UBC to a friend as a great place to work. Responses to leadership questions were more positive in 2017 than 2014.

Inclusion and respect in the workplace has two measures: treating each other with respect and consideration in the workplace, and feeling part of a community. For staff and faculty with disabilities there was a decline in agreement that people treated each other with respect and consideration between 2017 and 2014; conversely, they were much more likely to agree that they felt part of a community at UBC. Other smaller declines between 2017 and 2014 were in receiving effective feedback from their immediate unit head/manager, and recognition for accomplishments.
Consistent with the data on Aboriginal staff and faculty reported above, the small proportion of faculty and staff who identify as having a disability makes interpreting salary data difficult. One retirement, promotion or exit may significantly alter the distribution of salaries. Male staff and faculty self-identifying with disabilities have greater representation in the lower salary ranges than men without disabilities. Women staff and faculty self-identifying with disabilities are concentrated in the lowest full-time salary ranges. Representation of women and men with disabilities grows in the $100,000-$199,999/ annum range. Gender parity is greater with respect to salary ranges among people self-identifying with disabilities than among those who do not.

**Findings**: UBC’s employment trends indicate a decline in representation and workplace engagement for people who have self-identified as having a disability. Salary patterns require more exploration to understand whether people are able to progress through career stages and salary ranges when they are hired with disabilities, and when disability occurs during their career at UBC. People self-identifying with disabilities are much less likely than their colleagues to recommend UBC as a great place to work.

---

24 The data in this chart was downloaded October 15, 2016. There were 7,855 women and 6,103 men working at UBC on that date. Of them, 225 women and 144 men self-identified as persons with disabilities.
Visible Minority Staff & Faculty

Figure 9: Visible Minorities: Comparative Representation at Canadian Research Universities

At 33.1%, people who identify as a visible minority make up a much higher proportion of the workforce at UBC across all EEOGs than among the workforces at UofT, UofA and McGill, as well as in comparison to the 2011 Canadian available workforce of 18%.

Figure 10: Race/Ethnicity among Employees at UBC

UBC has a diverse population of faculty and staff, with the largest populations self-identifying as White and Chinese, followed by Filipino, South Asian, South East Asian and Latin American. This
chart is drawn from the supplemental question on the Employment Equity Survey, based on the Statistics Canada Census question. Respondents could choose more than one race/ethnicity to reflect mixed heritages.

Figure 11: 25-Year Trend in Visible Minority Tenure-Stream Faculty

The percentage of tenure-stream faculty self-identifying as a visible minority has gradually been increasing at UBC.

In the WES, trends from 2014 to 2017 are very positive for staff and faculty self-identifying as visible minorities. Faculty had a lower score in 2017 compared to 2014 when responding to their ability to meet service expectations, but otherwise scores were higher on every comparative measure. Those self-identifying as visible minorities across UBC overall only scored lower in 2017 compared to 2014 on measures related to respect and consideration in the workplace and seeing a clear link between their work and UBC’s long-term objectives.
When we begin to consider salaries for those who self-identify as a visible minority, representation is sufficient to look for trends or anomalies. In 2016-17, salary ranges for visible minorities across UBC tended to follow typical gender patterns, and there is higher representation in lower salary ranges for those self-identifying as visible minorities\(^{25}\). As with women who do not self-identify as a visible minority, visible minority women’s representation diminishes as salary ranges rise.

**Findings:** UBC is successfully diversifying its workforce with respect to visible minorities from many backgrounds. However, UBC needs to explore the differential representation of racialized people, particularly racialized women, in leadership roles.

**Staff & Faculty with Minority Sexual Orientations/Gender Identities**

This category combines data for those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer or questioning, trans, transsexual, intersex, asexual, + (any analogous term from the past, present, and/or future). Where data is available, information regarding people self-reporting with minority sexual orientations is combined with people self-reporting minority gender identities. However, there are instances where the numbers are too small, and data is not available for people with minority gender identities. In these cases, only information on the situation of people self-identifying with minority sexual orientations is provided.

---

\(^{25}\) The data in this chart was downloaded October 15, 2016. There were 7,855 women and 6,103 men working at UBC on that date. Of them, 1,829 women and 1,295 men self-identified as visible minorities.
The combined representation of self-reported persons with minority sexual identities and minority gender identities for 2017/18 is 7.64% of UBC’s workforce. This percentage is steadily increasing overall, though small numbers create large fluctuations in trends among particular EEOGs. There is no Canadian workforce availability comparison for these groups. UBC has a smaller representation of minority sexual orientation faculty and staff than UofT at 9%, but combined comparative data is not available.

Figure 14: 10-Year Trend in Minority Sexual Orientation Tenure Stream Faculty

- **Teaching Stream**: 8% (n=21) for 6-10 Years Ago, 10% (n=21) for 0-5 Years Ago
- **Research Stream**: 6% (n=130) for 6-10 Years Ago, 8% (n=130) for 0-5 Years Ago
The numbers are too small to report on minority gender identities among tenure stream faculty. However, representation of self-reported tenure stream faculty with minority sexual orientations is increasing. Representation of persons with minority sexual orientations/gender identities is higher than their self-reported representation elsewhere in the university among senior managers. This data is reported from 2010 onward, when UBC chose to include minority sexual orientations/gender identities as a designated equity group.

In comparison with 2014’s WES, faculty who self-identify with minority sexual orientations scores were higher when asked about the resources they had to support research and teaching, had declined when asked about fair tenure decisions, and fluctuated only slight (positive and negative) on all other measures. Overall, respondents who self-identify with minority sexual orientations scored much higher in 2017 on being involved in decisions that affect their work, opportunities to grow professionally, having confidence in UBC’s senior leadership, health & well-being, and feeling part of a community. Areas where scores were lower were respect and consideration in the workplace, and in seeing a clear link between their work and UBC’s long-term objectives.

The response rate was too low to provide trend data for those self-identifying with minority gender identities; however, scores on the WES for this group tended to be low, and were lower than all other equity-seeking groups on engagement, professional growth, student focus, and work environment.

Figure 15: Comparative Salary Data: Minority Sexual Orientation and Gender

Salary distributions for men and women with minority sexual orientations are generally consistent in the lower ranges, but 30% of women with minority sexual orientations receive
salaries over $100,000/annum compared to 24% of men with minority sexual orientations and 18% of heterosexual women. Numbers are too small to report on the salary distributions of people who self-identify with minority gender identities.

Findings: UBC is diversifying its workforce to include people with minority sexual orientations and/or gender identities, particularly at senior levels, though there is no Canadian workforce data to provide a baseline. Those self-identifying with minority gender identities who responded to the WES report less positive workplace experiences.

Women Staff & Faculty

Figure 16: Women – Comparative Representation at Canadian Research Universities

Women make up a greater percentage of the workforce across all employee occupational groups at UBC than the 2011 Canadian available workforce benchmark of 48%. The trend shows a slight increase and is higher than the latest published employment equity data for the UofA and McGill, but lower than that of the UofT.

Women employees have much lower representation than the 2011 Canadian available workforce in the Crafts & Trades, Skilled Sales & Service, and Other Sales & Service and Other Manual Workers. There has also been a sharp drop in representation of women among Semi-Skilled Manual Workers (from 23% in 2015/16 to 8% in 2016/17). UBC has much greater concentration of women in Senior Clerical and Clerical categories than the Canadian availability data, but over time, more men are moving into those roles – making them more representative of the actual available workforce.

26 The data in this chart was downloaded October 15, 2016. There were 7,855 women and 6,103 men working at UBC on that date. Of them, 298 women and 301 men self-identified as having a minority sexual orientation.
Figure 17: 25-Year Trend in Women Tenure-Stream Faculty

The representation of female tenure-track faculty over the last 25 years at UBC continues to increase at 34% in the research stream, and almost 55% in the teaching stream. Within academia in general, the research stream often garners greater salary and is awarded more prestige. UBC’s average of women tenure-track faculty overall is 43.5%. Comparatively, women make up 33% of the tenure stream faculty at McGill, and 34.4% at the UofA. The UofT does not have a comparatively reported statistic on all tenure-stream faculty, but reports that 48% of faculty overall (including non-tenure stream faculty) are women.

Figure 18: Comparative Representation of Women University Teachers by Rank – Canada/UBC

The representation of women university teachers by rank in Canada and UBC is shown in the figure. The percentage of women in each rank is compared between Canada 2016/17 and UBC 2017.
UBC reflects the Canadian averages from Statistics Canada data published by the Canadian Association of University Teachers\textsuperscript{27} (when UBC’s teaching stream professors are included in their equivalent ranking). As with other equity-seeking groups, current representation is uneven across UBC Faculties, and representation at the ranks of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor will determine the possibilities for greater representation in senior roles in the future.

In the WES, scores were higher from women staff and faculty in 2017 than they were in 2014 across almost all measures. The areas where this was not the case are: seeing a clear link between their work and UBC’s long-term objectives, respect and consideration in the workplace, having the materials and equipment needed to do their job, and recommending UBC to a friend as a great place to work. Women tenure-stream faculty were more likely to agree with positive statements in every area of the tenure-stream faculty-only questions.

Figure 19: Comparative Salary Data: 7-Year Trend by Gender

![Full-Time Salary Ranges by Sex - Comparison from 2011/12 & 2016/17](chart)

Over time, there has been an increase in the proportion of women in higher salary categories. Across the workforce, 21% of women are receiving salaries over $100,000/year, compared to 40% of men\textsuperscript{28}. Further exploration is necessary to determine whether those proportions accurately reflect women’s representation in roles that are valued at over $100,000 for men. In 2016/17, women, and particularly women also belonging to any other designated equity group, have higher representation among the lowest salary categories. The exception to this is women self-identifying with minority sexual orientations: only 25% are found in the lowest salary range.


\textsuperscript{28} The data in this chart was downloaded October 15, 2016. There were 7,855 women and 6,103 men working at UBC on that date.
Findings: Women’s representation across UBC’s workforce is growing, but is often concentrated in areas that are traditionally gendered as female. Women’s workplace experiences are trending positively, and salaries have risen over the last five years. However, it requires further exploration to understand representation of women vs. men among staff within these salary categories.

Trends in Leadership Roles by Designated Equity Groups

Figure 20: Representation of Designated Equity Groups Among Senior Managers at UBC

Over the last seven years, only people with minority sexual/gender identities among designated equity groups have significantly increased their representation at UBC’s Senior Leadership level (including Associate Vice Presidents, Deans, Deputy Vice Chancellor, President, Registrar, University Librarian, Vice Presidents). UofT shows very similar representation at the senior management level. McGill and UofA do not provide data for each EEOG category for all designated equity groups.
Figure 21: Representation of Designated Equity Groups Among Middle Managers at UBC

For the Middle and Other Managers EEOG, UBC is at or above the 2011 Canadian available workforce for all designated equity groups except persons with disabilities. Examples of positions included in this category are Associate Deans, Chairs, Computer Systems Manager, Directors, Financial Manager, Food Services Manager, and Heads of Department.

Figure 22: Representation of Designated Equity Groups Among University Teachers at UBC

Representation rates for designated equity groups are relatively static among university teachers (which includes Adjunct Professors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Clinical Professors or Instructors, Lecturers, Member Extra Sessional Studies, Professors, Senior Instructors, Sessionals). The percentage of women represented in the university teachers EEOG category overall in 2017-18 is 41.6%, compared to representation in the 2011 Canadian workforce availability data which is 43.3%.
Conclusions from the Demographic Trends

The data presented regarding representation of designated equity groups at UBC is descriptive data. Self-selection bias and small sample sizes make statistical significance tests and regression analyses difficult. However, it does not necessarily follow that the depictions are inaccurate; the data and the perceptions of the representatives of designated equity groups who responded to the Workplace Experiences Survey indicate areas that require further exploration. UBC’s willingness to carefully examine the data that does exist, and to surface the areas where further investigation is necessary, is indicative of its sincerity and commitment to fulfill the ‘inclusion’ theme of the new strategic plan.

When those in leadership roles, including faculty, are not as diverse as our student population, some may see barriers to the advancement of equity groups. A response to this is to critically examine UBC’s hiring practices and objectives, and appropriately engage and support members of designated equity groups throughout the university, particularly at senior levels, so that we can all develop the necessary competencies to create an inclusive campus.

Overall engagement scores for those who participated in the WES are lower among designated equity group members self-identifying as Aboriginal, having a disability, having a minority sexual orientation or gender identity. UBC could be missing out on the full contributions of those members. Inclusion and respect are significant factors in engagement, and from the WES results, it is even more significant for staff than for faculty. Research cited earlier shows that inclusive workplaces are more innovative; in a university this is a competitive advantage for research and for attracting and retaining students.

Salary trend data across equity groups and among faculty and staff as a whole also raise some areas for further exploration. There has been work done over the last decade to try to interrupt some of these patterns at UBC through pay equity initiatives29.

Systems are path dependent, and strategies and policy decisions from the past determine behaviour and the competencies people develop to enact decisions30. Competencies become the first choice for approaching new challenges, narrowing the range of choices and tending to create similar results to those of the past. To create change, it is necessary to look at the system as self-reinforcing and determine where structures, strategies, and competencies can be shifted or interrupted to increase diversity and inclusion31.

UBC faculty, staff and students have been working on increasing diversity and inclusion for a long time. Gains in hiring, changes in training and conversations regarding differences, including the concerns raised by members of designated equity groups, and enthusiasm and curiosity about how to do the work of inclusion demonstrate this. Throughout the discussion of employment systems that follows, initiatives that have worked are highlighted, and can be amplified in system change efforts.

**Envisioning an Inclusive UBC**

Consultation participants envision an increasingly inclusive campus where UBC is a global leader, demonstrating these values at all leadership levels, and enhancing the feeling of openness and willingness to learn about other perspectives. There is accountability among all levels of leadership to develop people and workplaces that are inclusive, and this accountability is supported by increasingly robust data. Participants are creating an environment where all can engage and contribute. They see leadership, faculty, staff, and students assuming generous intent and asking for help to better understand when things don’t work as planned.

**Policy and Practice Through the Lens of Equity Groups**

“*Equity and diversity are integral to the mission of the University of British Columbia, and UBC strives to be a community in which equity is embedded in all areas of academic, work and campus life. As one of Canada’s top research universities, a commitment to equity allows us to attract the best teachers and researchers from across Canada and round the world.*”

-Santa J. Ono, President and Vice-Chancellor, The University of British Columbia

UBC’s policies and Human Resources guidelines are publicly available on the UBC website. Policies that are directly related to employment equity were reviewed during this process and are discussed in the sections below.

The review of employment systems which follows is based on the premise that UBC is actively looking for ways to increase inclusion as a competitive advantage in the 21st century and in fulfilment of its role as a global leader in higher education.

---

32 Ono, Santa J., 2016, *UBC’s Commitment to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion within the CRC Program*, [https://academic.ubc.ca/awards-funding/funding-opportunities/canada-research-chairs/ubcs-commitment-equity-diversity](https://academic.ubc.ca/awards-funding/funding-opportunities/canada-research-chairs/ubcs-commitment-equity-diversity)

33 Office of the University Counsel, *Index of All Policies, Guidelines and Rules*, [https://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/index/](https://universitycounsel.ubc.ca/policies/index/)

UBC Senate policies can be found here: [https://senate.ubc.ca/](https://senate.ubc.ca/)

34 UBC Human Resources, *Hiring & Managing* [http://www.hr.ubc.ca/hiring-managing/](http://www.hr.ubc.ca/hiring-managing/)
Overarching Workplace Policies:

UBC Human Resources provides guidance on policy and practices for faculty and staff at Hiring & Managing at UBC. In addition, the UBC Statement on Respectful Environment for Students, Faculty and Staff, instituted in 2008 and updated in 2014, also supports the values of respect, civility, diversity, opportunity, and inclusion.

Policy #2: Employment Equity was recently updated: “The fundamental principle for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff at The University of British Columbia is individual achievement and merit. Consistent with this principle, the University will: advance the interests of women and Indigenous, disabled, and racialized persons; ensure that fair and equal opportunity is afforded to all who seek employment at the University; and treat equitably all faculty and staff.”

Accommodations for students with disabilities is guided by Policy #73. The Centre for Accessibility (formerly Access & Diversity) primarily works with students but also provides some support for staff and faculty with disabilities. UBC has a return to work/remain at work program for current employees who are injured or become ill during their employment, but for those people with a disability who might wish to work at UBC, comprehensive information on available supports can be difficult to find and there is not a policy for staff that is comparable to Policy #73 for students.

Policies specific to particular employment systems will be discussed under the relevant section, and specific recommendations pertinent to that employment system are at the end of each particular section.

Review of Employment Systems

Recruitment

Job postings are often the first encounter with UBC for new employees. It is important that all potential candidates, particularly those from each of the designated equity groups, see how their communities are reflected in the posting. Plain language, gender neutral language, a statement about possible accommodations for disability, and a statement acknowledging the territorial lands where campuses are located can be brief but will indicate UBC’s values to those applying.

Policy 20: Advertising of Available Employment Positions was updated in June 2017. It requires, among other things, that the following University Diversity statement be included in all position advertisements:

“Equity and diversity are essential to academic excellence. An open and diverse community fosters the inclusion of voices that have been underrepresented or discouraged. We encourage applications from members of groups that have been
marginalized on any grounds enumerated under the B.C. Human Rights Code, including sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, racialization, disability, political belief, religion, marital or family status, age, and/or status as a First Nation, Metis, Inuit, or Indigenous person.”

This statement communicates UBC’s commitments to consider the full diversity of people who are qualified for a particular post and reinforces its values of equity, diversity and academic freedom. In a random audit of job postings on the Careers website in February/March 2018, it was clear that while most advertisements do include the above diversity statement, some do not.

Human Resources provides comprehensive guidelines for recruiting a new employee. There is information about job classifications (in the case of staff positions) and writing a job advertisement. Templates are provided that can be revised. Part of the standard UBC template for job positions, used in most online job postings, has a “Consequence of Error/Judgement” statement. Some could interpret these as an unusual and somewhat forbidding warning to any prospective recruits about the possible repercussions of mistakes by anyone holding the position. It does not support the desire for innovation and learning from mistakes that form part of the themes in *Shaping UBC’s Next Century*. In an audit of job postings for UofT, McGill, and UofA, no similar statement was found.

Some job postings were also found to include requirements for working in a diverse environment (e.g., “intercultural skills”, “ability to work in a diverse team”, etc.) Best practices in recruitment show that developing criteria and weighting the relative importance of each criterion for that job as early as possible in the process helps to reduce cognitive bias later in the process. Carefully assessing the need for particular criteria in the context of the team’s strengths is essential (e.g., all seven members of a team may not need excellent written communication skills). Weighting criteria at the same time as the job description is developed enables more inclusion and more confidence in the selection process. Including weighted criteria for creating and participating in inclusive workplaces could include non-traditional research, multilingual capacity, and/or a demonstration of ability to engage in difficult conversations.

Research has demonstrated that a more rigorous interview process leads to better reliability of results. Systematically implementing interviewer training, rating each question separately, aggregating and anonymizing the ratings from each interviewer before discussing ratings,


having more than one interviewer helps to increase the reliability that each interviewer evaluating the same performance will evaluate it similarly. These practices are recommended in the comprehensive guidelines from Human Resources, though may not be implemented in all searches. For interviewing according to a new set of criteria for diversity skills and strengths, discussing the reasoning behind the ratings given can also improve reliability of the interviewer ratings.

UBC will be optimizing a framework of foundational strengths for engaging constructively with diversity across differences. Some work has been done with a cohort of managers who completed an Intercultural Understanding course as part of UBC’s Place & Promise plan, and ways to continue that work are being explored.

Opportunities and Challenges

There are important opportunities and resources available at UBC to support systems shift. These include Strategy & Decision Support (SDS) in the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic, HR, and the Equity & Inclusion Office, and the special program approval process from the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal for preferring particular equity groups in hiring. These resources can help with designing an appropriate strategy and budgetary commitment to appoint the best candidates, ensuring the hiring of those with skills and strengths in engaging differences at UBC.

UBC has significant expertise through the First Nations House of Learning and First Nations and Indigenous Studies to assist with interpreting the responses by self-identified Aboriginal staff and faculty on satisfaction and engagement. Through the Indigenous Strategic Plan opportunities are provided to improve effective recruitment and engagement practices.

---

38 British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal, Special Programs, http://www.bchrt.bc.ca/law-library/employment-equity/special-programs.htm
Opportunities though, can also bring challenges. In the majority of EEOGs, UBC exceeds the Canadian availability data on the representation of women and visible minorities; however, staff and faculty members from designated equity groups are often asked to participate in numerous panels, committees, and consultations in addition to their regular workload. While this can assist with building networks and experience, it can also make meeting output expectations more challenging, particularly if it is not acknowledged as a work requirement and offset in some way. Workload structuring and development plans for members of designated equity groups should clearly reflect their commitments to inclusive representation, and realistically assess the additional supports needed for them to accomplish this work as well as the functions of their position.

Staff members self-identifying as women and as racialized people are more likely to recommend UBC as a great place to work. Staff members self-identifying as having a disability, a minority gender identity, a minority sexual orientation, or self-identifying as Aboriginal are less likely to recommend UBC as a great place to work. What can we learn from women and racialized people that would make for a more inclusive environment for those with a disability, a minority gender identity, sexual orientation or who are indigenous?

Building relationships with communities and organizations relies on respectful engagement. Part of that is recognizing the efforts that applications and interviews take on the part of the applicant, and communicating the results to applicants – with feedback, if requested by those who were interviewed. This step maintains the relationship, and begins the process of recruiting for another more suitable position in the future.

Hiring of promising PhD candidates from designated equity groups into tenure-stream faculty or lecturer positions provides a promising opportunity for diversity and for nurturing early career academics. It can also be challenging as a new faculty member must balance completing their PhD with the requirements of their new position. UBC could develop a diverse scholars program where a PhD candidate in their final year (from another institution) is paid to spend a year at UBC writing and teaching a course. This would allow them to work for a year and for people to get to know them so that they are naturally seen to be a good candidate for a new position.

A review of UBC executive/senior leadership search firms’ websites reveals that they may have difficulty convening a diverse panel from their own staff to screen applicants. As systems tend to replicate themselves, search firms’ capacities for ensuring screening according to UBC values/strategies should be part of UBC’s approved vendor decisions. The Race and Leadership Group Recommendations to the Vice-Presidents’ Strategic Committee on Equity and Diversity (VPSICED) also address this issue.

**Recruitment Recommendations:**

1. Update recruitment guidelines to reflect promising practices to increase equity, such as:
• Revising job templates to include more accessible and inclusive language, including links to how equity seeking groups are supported at UBC.
• Developing the relative weighting of the importance of different skills, strengths, and experience to the job in advance of any interviewing or resume review.
• Including strengths and skills for contributing to an inclusive workplace in the job advertisement and job descriptions.
• Ensuring that all interviewees are notified of the results of a search, and depending on systems solutions that may arise in the Integrated Renewal Program for data management, expand this to applicants.

2. Develop a framework of foundational strengths and skills for engaging constructively with diversity across differences. Such a framework includes clear definitions of the necessary skills and strengths, criteria for evaluation, and links to the UBC strategic plan and Indigenous strategic plan, and to commitments to increasing inclusion at all levels.

3. For new hires from Indigenous communities, connect with the First Nations House of Learning and the Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology to prepare an inclusive environment in the work unit in advance of hiring.

4. Human Resources and the Equity & Inclusion Office work with Strategy & Decision Support in the Office of the Provost to develop and promote a clear and accessible process to implement the BC Human Rights Tribunal’s special program approval for targeted hiring initiatives across UBC, including the advance planning, recruitment and selection processes that are required.

5. Expand efforts by HR and individual units to proactively build institutional relationships with communities and organizations representing designated equity group members.

6. In the next RFP process for search firms, include criteria on representation, diversity and inclusive teams.
Selection and Hiring

When people apply to positions at UBC they become part of the ‘applicant pool’. An understanding of representation in the applicant pool compared to external availability data tells us how well we are attracting candidates which represent the diversity in their field. Collection of this data allows us to track our ability to recruit designated groups from application through short listing to appointment. Further, applicant pool data is useful in identifying trends and may also reveal patterns that create barriers for equity-seeking groups.

Currently, centralized applicant pool data for faculty and staff searches is unavailable at the institutional level, though it is being collected by some faculties and for particular searches (e.g., Canada Research Chairs). Where collected, demographic questions are part of the application process, responses are voluntary, membership in a designated equity group is self-reported, and the data is separated from the application information that a selection committee sees in order to provide a safeguard against bias.

UofT and McGill collect and publish applicant pool data as part of their employment equity reports. At the UofT, representation among faculty and staff for women and persons with disabilities is at or exceeding the percentages in the applicant pools. However, for racialized

Successes

Selection committees for faculty positions are provided with unconscious bias training, either from the Equity & Inclusion Office working with Faculty Relations, or from other resources within the university (e.g. Faculty Equity Leads, etc.). In some departments/units, managers hiring staff attend behavioural interviewing training which has a component on diversity. At this point, almost everyone who will participate in a faculty selection committee at UBC has participated in the basic unconscious bias training. Because of that, certain faculties are developing “next stage” training, to look more closely at what biases may tend to surface among their faculty members, and within particular searches.

A plan to address better recruitment practices for people with minority sexual orientations/ gender identities has also recently been drafted by the UBC Vice-Presidential Trans, Two-Spirit and Gender Diversity Task Force.

In addition, efforts have been made to create diverse interview panels; this was mentioned in the consultations by interviewees as something that made an immediate difference in their ability to feel at ease during the interviews. When interviewees were asked directly about whether a more representative interview committee felt contrived or tokenistic, they were adamant that it did not.
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people/people of colour and Indigenous peoples/Aboriginal peoples of North America, the representation is lower than the proportions applying for those positions.

With current efforts under way to update recruitment systems and the HR data management systems at UBC, it is an opportune time to enhance and standardize the collection of applicant pool data, including data about offers of employment made versus those accepted. These enhancements are critical in supporting university efforts to identify barriers to recruitment and selection of particular groups.

One challenge identified for a new employee with a disability is that the cost to develop a functional workplace falls almost entirely on the unit/department and often requires the individual to advocate for themselves. HR Advisors within faculties/units can provide support in setting up a workplace with dignity, however, new employees have little guidance on the process or requirements and may hesitate to reveal their need for more information and support to make this successful. A policy, similar to Policy #73 on student accommodation would help to provide clarity. The current lack of clarity could create barriers to selecting candidates with disabilities. UBC currently employs people with disabilities at well below the Canadian 2011 workforce availability, based on the self-disclosure in the employment equity surveys.

**Selection & Hiring Recommendations:**

1. With appropriate notices, safeguards and practices, routinely collect applicant pool data for all recruitment at UBC, as well as data about short listing, offers of employment made, and offers of employment accepted.

2. Develop an Accommodation for Employees with Disabilities policy or guidelines to be consistent with the definition of disability in Policy 73, developing a similar centralized mechanism to provide accommodations with privacy and dignity, and providing support for both employees and supervisors to create an inclusive workplace. Publicize the new policy/guidelines and implementation process widely and with a hyperlink in each job advertisement.

3. Continue to develop “next level” search training to incorporate the latest research about effective strategies to create equitable selection processes, based on past success in the programs developed by the Equity & Inclusion Office, in individual faculties at UBC, and with diverse selection committees.

4. In keeping with UBC’s mission to build new knowledge, there is a key opportunity to develop, pilot, and validate an “engaging differences” diversity skills and strengths framework. During the selection and hiring phase of employment, this would involve developing a set of interview questions to test for inclusive skills and strengths, and then validating those, and evaluating over time which skills and strengths are reliable predictors of engagement with different perspectives in ways that further critical thinking and create innovative, inclusive workplaces.
Training & Development

UBC provides numerous training and development opportunities for faculty and staff. Mandatory online training modules on bullying and harassment, new worker safety orientation, and privacy and information security fundamentals are part of employee on-boarding and support compliance with government regulations. In addition, self-directed learning and participation in training are encouraged.

UBC provides generous professional development funding for staff, with specific allotments varying according to employee group. There are also many leadership, health and wellbeing, workplace learning, and other training opportunities across campus.

For faculty members in their first two years of an administrative leadership role, the Academic Leadership Development Program is available at UBC Vancouver. At UBC Okanagan, the Academic Leadership Series provides faculty with workshops, studios, coaching, and online learning to support their growth in the role. For managers in staffing units at both campuses, Managing@UBC provides professional development through online and in-person self-directed learning modules.

Participants in the consultations told us that they valued each of these programs; however, participation requires finding time within already heavy workloads. Despite UBC’s commitments to equity, diversity and inclusion, there are no modules that specifically address how to support diversity and inclusion in the workplace.

UBC also provides specific support to enhance inclusion through workshops provided by the Equity & Inclusion Office, the Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, Conflict Theatre@UBC, and Extended Learning. These offerings focus on promising practices and flexibility in responding to particular workplace challenges.

Coaching and mentoring are also offered in various ways across UBC. All faculty and staff have access to six free coaching sessions as part of Coaching@UBC. Mentoring opportunities within workplaces often depend on departmental leadership, and in some units new employees have access to an “onboarding buddy” who supports them over a number of months as an informal mentor. The Indigenous Staff Support Group provides peer mentoring and support for Indigenous staff members who may often be the only Indigenous person in a unit/department.

Mentoring is only specifically addressed in the WES for tenure-stream faculty. All tenure-stream faculty emphasize the need for mentorship, and all equity groups feel significantly stronger about this, in particular Indigenous faculty members. In consultations, senior faculty expressed the idea that once faculty members had achieved their first promotion, they no

---

longer needed a mentor. The feeling was that after their years in the institution, they had it figured out. However, WES respondents from designated equity groups contradict this perception. In addition, research into implicit bias demonstrates that these biases are also absorbed by designated equity group members: research funding amounts requested are often lower, members are less likely to cite their own research, less likely to mention their own leadership efforts on behalf of the university, etc.43.

Perhaps because some kind of mentoring program is generally set up for assistant professors, the strongest scores for mentorship for tenure-stream faculty tended to be higher across designated equity groups at the associate and full professor level. In the absence of an institutional response to the need for mentors, mentoring happens informally, and often by more senior members of designated equity groups. However, such duties are not always recognized in the service portion of workload assignments. In a tenure-track system that prioritizes research and publications, these commitments may impact promotion decisions for members of faculty from designated equity groups who are actively working to support colleagues or students from the same designated equity group by allocating time for listening, coaching, and mentoring. More formal mentoring programs would make this mentoring
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‘work’, and its related time commitment more explicit and eligible to be considered in workload discussions.

One of the surprising trends in the WES was the greater concern that faculty members from designated equity groups have regarding professional growth: the fact that this tends to continue across ranks may mean that faculty members are interested in opportunities to develop leadership skills and move into senior leadership ranks.

UBC’s Senior Advisor to the Provost on Women Faculty has a study underway to look at best practices in mentorship in higher education.

Among self-identified persons with disabilities, Aboriginal peoples, and people with minority sexual orientations/gender identities, WES data shows lower scores on feedback and recognition from immediate heads. Early and frequent training and communications to immediate heads about how, and how often, to provide clear and appropriate feedback to direct reports could help to offset this. Being aware of the ways that representatives from designated equity groups are doing more informal inclusiveness training, mentoring, and service work in committees is an important way that immediate heads can observe, recognize, and perhaps adjust workloads to accommodate when necessary.

Through the WES, staff in management and professional roles who self-identified as Aboriginal expressed work/life integration as a concern. Further, consultations with Indigenous staff and managers revealed that having to remind people of Indigenous heritage, history, and perspectives at UBC, while gauging levels of interest and openness to mitigate backlash, is often an unrecognized part of their workload.

Restoring ‘right relationships’ among Indigenous Peoples and the rest of the population means untangling the systems of rights and privileges that continue to reinforce historically exploitative relationships. For non-Indigenous people at UBC, developing their understanding of these relationships, and continually seeking Indigenous perspectives about how to move toward more respectful and equitable ones, would acknowledge commitments made under the Truth & Reconciliation Commission. As an example, UBC Okanagan administrators mentioned a very successful learning series that was set up with local Elders that could be used as a model for future learning on both campuses.

A predominant theme of the consultations at all levels was an interest in training opportunities that address participating in, developing, and managing an inclusive workplace. There is


enthusiasm and a desire to develop competencies in many of the areas that are challenges at the moment:

- recruiting and selecting for excellence and inclusion, and understanding the existing expertise that can support particular searches and selections;
- managing conflicts constructively;
- creating space for open and honest conversations about how workplaces might change to be more inclusive;
- engaging with leadership about what this really means for and at UBC;
- developing a rigorous and evidence-based lens for examining efforts and creating and incorporating new knowledge from across UBC and elsewhere; and
- figuring out how to manage developing these new competencies within competing workloads, priorities, and sometimes competing values.

Current training opportunities for faculty through the Academic Leadership Development Program are not explicitly focused on inclusive workplaces, though sessions do incorporate some aspects of this. Managing@UBC, for staff leadership, does not have explicit modules focused on this either.

There are few training sessions that are mandatory, even for those who are managing staff and students and have a duty to report issues. Institutionally, this creates potential liability or at least reputational risk for UBC with students, faculty and staff. Management, and particularly inclusive management, may never have been an area addressed in staff and faculty leadership training, and for which many may not have a natural talent. Developing a system to monitor current and/or growing competency in fostering inclusive workplaces at all levels, among all of the UBC community, will create accountability and incentives for new learning.

**Training & Development Recommendations:**

1. Continue to promote the professional development programs and opportunities that UBC offers to all staff and faculty, and make discussion of these opportunities part of every performance review meeting to encourage uptake.

2. Explore possibilities for mentoring based on the Senior Advisor to the Provost on Women Faculty’s research, and pilot new programs for both faculty and staff.

3. Support the professional development of immediate heads with training in how to provide feedback and recognition, with particular attention to extra work that may be going unnoticed or not recognized as service in workload assignment.

4. Develop a modular training program that addresses different aspects of creating an inclusive workplace, using different learning methodologies for different topics.
Promotion & Tenure

For UBC’s staff and non-tenure-stream faculty the institutional data does not yet provide a clear picture of promotions and/or career path, however this is being developed by Planning and Institutional Research. Different collective agreements can determine, to some extent, the movement within that employee group and between employee groups. In consultations with BCGEU, CUPE 116, AAPS, CUPE 2950, and Faculty Association representatives, it was recognized that collective agreements are historical documents that have been adapted over time to create fairness in employment. Representatives are interested in thinking about how to adapt collective agreements to more equitably support members of designated groups at UBC.

Across North America, there is a recognition that contract faculty face challenges in achieving job security and/or moving into tenure-track positions\textsuperscript{46}. UBC has shown a commitment to improving the experiences of contract faculty through the expansion of lecturer positions. In 2006, UBC had three times as many sessional lecturers (short-term faculty) as non-tenure-track lecturers (long-term), and since 2017, there have been more long-term lecturers than sessional lecturers.

In the WES, professional growth is a top factor in engagement, and for staff from all designated equity groups, seeing a link between their own work, no matter how personally satisfying, and UBC’s long-term objectives was not clear. Improved communication about organizational directions and more opportunities for growth and advancement need to be reinforced in meetings with immediate heads.

Tenure-stream Faculty

There is an institutional career path for tenure-stream faculty at UBC, and clear data to monitor the equity along that career path. Analysis of this data has contributed to efforts and success at making promotions and salaries more equitable.

In 2010, analysis of tenure stream salaries surfaced inequities in pay for women faculty and a pay equity award of 2% was provided in 2012. In addition, the position of Senior Advisor to the Provost on Women Faculty was created in 2014 to ensure ongoing monitoring.

Because of sample size, it is not always possible to look at differential effects on men and women in each designated equity group, however, it is important to understand that an effect on any group may not be equally distributed. In general, women and people self-identifying with disabilities take longer to achieve their first and second promotions to tenure, even when number and length of tenure time clock adjustments are made. However, when women with tenure clock adjustments are compared to men with tenure clock adjustments overall, men are promoted more slowly at UBC (contradicting a prevailing belief that men who take tenure delays all use that time to advance their career\(^{47}\)). Differential impacts on work/life integration, workload and promotions can occur for parents returning from maternity, parental, and adoption (MPA) leave if they return during a term where they were to be immediately expected to begin teaching on their return: this could mean that the final months of MPA are spent designing the course, and that re-entry to work is harder than for those who return over the summer. Heads of units should be cognizant of not assigning teaching immediately upon return if there is design or course preparation required prior to teaching.

In general, tenure-track faculty who self-identify as visible minorities or self-identify as having a minority sexual orientation take less time through their first and second promotions to tenure, even when number and length of tenure clock adjustments are made. There was not enough data to provide time to promotion for tenure-stream faculty self-identifying as Aboriginal.

Data can often be disaggregated to look at different Faculties within the context of their respective campuses. Time to first and second promotion and relative salaries are important indicators of inequity and need to be considered as part of regular departmental/unit monitoring and reporting, just as budgets are.

Promotions and tenure for faculty depend on evaluations of excellence in scholarly activity\(^{48}\) and teaching. Defining scholarly activity and impact can be an issue with emerging areas of research\(^{49}\). Recognizing capacities for managing diversity with respect to staff and students or the training of high quality performers is important to building an engaged and collaborative team. Hiring for innovative perspectives and research may require those involved in tenure reviews to develop a broader understanding of scholarly activity and impact, and how it may be


demonstrated in some of the most non-traditional and cutting-edge research. Examining how and whether scholarship related to designated equity groups is valued in promotion and tenure is an important part of this systems-change process.\(^{50}\)

Tenure-stream faculty from designated equity groups scored lower in the WES regarding promotions and tenure: particularly in regards to the fairness of decisions and a lack of clarity on the process, criteria and body of evidence that lead to promotion. When asked about this in consultation sessions, faculty members felt the information provided in general workshops was very vague because there is such diversity in the different Faculties; or that the information was contradictory, depending on who was asked; or sometimes, that there seemed to be an assumption that everyone would have a trusted colleague or even a family member who could guide them. This links to the need for more mentorship, but also to broader and clearer criteria to evaluate exemplary excellence in diverse scholarship within a Faculty.

A recurring theme in consultations was fairness with respect to workload, and how workload is calculated in different Faculties. There are questions about the relative weighting of the “housekeeping work” of keeping a Department running, including, for example, teaching introductory courses, serving on committees and ad hoc working groups, informal mentoring and advising, as well as question about which designated equity group(s) tend to be responsible, by default, for that work. These issues are supported by the research.\(^{51}\) The Faculty of Arts and the Allard School of Law are currently considering a pilot project in collaboration with the Senior Advisor to the Provost

---


on Women Faculty to explore different measures that might more equitably measure and distribute workload among faculty.

Indigenous Faculty

The 11 Indigenous tenure-stream faculty who responded to the WES in 2017 were less likely to be clear about the proof, criteria or body of evidence for earning tenure or promotion, than other designated equity groups, and than for those faculty not identifying as a member of an equity group. They also had concerns about their ability to meet expectations for research and teaching and the resources provided for support.

Twenty-two Indigenous faculty members provided feedback that suggests there is a need for more support for teaching, research, service and educational leadership. To increase respect and inclusion, most suggested having colleagues and leaders model inclusive behaviour.

They provided information about some factors that participants felt were affecting the success of tenure track Indigenous scholars, including:

- **a cultural orientation that values relationship-building over time**: this orientation is necessary to create the foundations for strong research. Many Indigenous scholars seek to work with different indigenous communities and nations. Relationships and the understanding of cultural protocols take time to establish. Progress is not based on transactional models of relationships but rather reciprocal models, where speed is not a defining factor. This may conflict with tenure clock timelines.

- **a strong desire and sense of obligation to support Indigenous students**, who at the same time want to be supported by someone with similar cultural perspectives. This often results in supervision of many more graduate students per Indigenous tenure-track faculty member than among other faculty members, and may not be differentially accounted for in workload calculations;

- **additional time required and invested into participating in workplace and campus engagements**, such as selection committees, consultations, panels, community celebrations and representation on campus, cultural welcomes of major speakers, etc. As there are so few Indigenous faculty across the institution and it is important that Indigenous perspectives are represented, these commitments are honoured, but time is diverted from research and teaching.

- **an obligation to question, or support questioning of, some of the foundational assumptions at the university and in society in courses and conversations**: this sometimes results in discomfort for those who are typically privileged by these assumptions. There is a qualitative difference in challenging orthodoxy in mathematics or chemistry in classroom settings relative to challenging, for example, prevailing perspectives around property rights or what constitutes knowledge or justice. Both scenarios present opportunities for new learning, but the first is often less emotionally laden as questions of identity are not a critical part of the discussion. The additional work needed to productively approach these tensions regarding identity, to create new understandings, and develop new knowledge, is often unrecognized by those evaluating teaching scores and/or workload.
Participants noted that these additional factors may not only affect one’s teaching and research performance, but a lack of formal consideration of these within the current systems of evaluating tenure may actually lead to an inaccurate recognition of performance. From their perspective, this may create a barrier to success for current and future Indigenous tenure-track scholars.

Faculty with Disabilities

The 35 tenure-stream faculty who self-identified as persons with disabilities on the WES had significantly lower scores than other designated equity groups, and support for engaging students in research/scholarly/creative work was the lowest score among the tenure-stream questions. However, those participating in the WES did offer suggestions about how their experiences could improve. Recommendations and priorities included: improving the workspace (24 respondents), more clearly defining the criteria for promotion and tenure, and providing more resources for teaching, research, and educational leadership. With respect to workspaces, faculty with disabilities were much more likely to disagree that the physical work environment is suited to fulfilling responsibilities.

Visible Minority Faculty

Exploring the survey responses of the 101 tenure-stream faculty members who self-identified as visible minorities in the WES, the lowest scores for their workplace experiences were found in regards to fairness of re-appointments, promotions and tenure; support for engaging students in research/scholarly/creative work; and resources to support teaching. This is interesting because the Faculty Dashboards tell us that tenure-track faculty self-identifying as visible minorities tend to achieve tenure more quickly than their counterparts. It may be that the question has not differentiated enough among re-appointments, promotions, and tenure, and that the concerns with fairness have more to do with the low relative rates of promotion (see chart below) to senior leadership among tenured professors who self-identify as visible minorities.

For tenure-track women faculty, Indigenous faculty, racialized faculty, faculty with disabilities, and faculty with minority sexual orientations, the decisions, process, criteria, and body of evidence considered for earning tenure or promotion were rated lower than those not from a designated equity group. While there were variations across agreement with the other questions, all designated equity groups were less likely to agree that decisions about tenure and promotions were fair. Based on the numbers of ways that bias can impact performance

---

evaluations\textsuperscript{53, 54} each Faculty should consider ways to be transparent about tenure and promotion requirements, criteria, processes, and decisions.

The research reinforces the need for academic heads to have training in providing appropriate, clear and frequent feedback\textsuperscript{55} to their faculty and staff to increase engagement and productivity\textsuperscript{56}, and to develop plans to mitigate the ways in which performance feedback can be biased in a department or unit. UBC HR has a variety of tools to support performance feedback on its website.

\textbf{Senior Leadership}
Inclusion at the leadership level is essential to modeling the commitment to inclusion across the institution. It is also good organizational strategy, as demonstrated in this study of 180 organizations in four countries\textsuperscript{57}: “The findings were startlingly consistent: for companies ranking in the top quartile for executive-board diversity, ROEs [Returns on Equity] were 53 percent higher, on average, than they were for those in the bottom quartile.” UBC has developed a faculty that has representation of all designated equity groups: not fully proportional to the workforce availability, but close. The candidate pool for middle and senior leadership provides opportunities for diversifying the representation in these EEOGs.

Among the 57 senior leaders at UBC, self-identified representation is not reflective of the wider pool of Full Professors who self-identify as members of these designated equity groups at UBC. While not all Full Professors are interested in senior leadership positions, achieving inclusive leadership requires efforts to identify interest and potential, and intentionally creating opportunities to develop leaders, particularly among those groups who are less likely to see themselves reflected at leadership levels. It may also require re-evaluation of leadership skills to include diversity competencies or inclusion skills such as working across difference, conflict engagement, intercultural fluency, etc.

**Promotions & Tenure Recommendations:**

1. Develop and provide data on promotions among all employees (staff and faculty) at UBC to Unit/Department heads for transparent conversations about where designated equity groups may be disadvantaged by learned and unconscious biases about capacity and performance.

2. Evaluate the results of pilots regarding workload policy re-developments and expand awareness of alternatives across UBC.

3. Provide research-based training, with clear equity data, to immediate Heads, promotion committees, and tenure review committees to ensure that promotions and tenure decisions are made using strategies to reduce bias and barriers to designated equity groups.

4. Review the skills and strengths required to become a senior leader at UBC, incorporating diversity competencies or inclusion skills as part of the requirements for appointment.
Recognition, Awards & Retention

Health Promotion and Benefits programming affects retention, and UBC has generous benefits programming and well-being initiatives. Maintaining benefits coverage was suggested as one reason that older employees, particularly tenured professors, may be reluctant to retire, it is a perception that benefits are no longer available just when health costs may be increasing. More information should be provided about the benefits available through the Emeritus College (formerly UBCAPE).

The Return to Work/Remain at Work and Work Re-Integration and Accommodation Program (WRAP) programs are instrumental in creating the conditions for those experiencing illness, injury, or disability to continue their employment during or after recovery. Program guidelines are in place to support necessary accommodations and the privacy, dignity, and respect of employees, though the central fund for equipment is over-extended.

A pilot project with the support of UBC’s insurance company is also being implemented to assist those with complex mental health and/or chronic pain to continue their employment. New resources for emotional and mental health are available to support HR Advisors at UBC Vancouver as well, though consultation participants felt that ensuring that HR Advisors across campus are aware of them and accessing them in a timely manner is can be a challenge.

Housing cost was a factor cited as a barrier to recruitment and retention in almost all consultation meetings at the UBC Vancouver campus. UBC Vancouver has a faculty housing program and relocation allowance, and is also piloting a housing program for staff with rent tied to 30% of income below $64,000/annum. To support lower wage employees in operations, research shows that subsidizing childcare and transit would increase recruitment and retention58.

---

Successes

UBC’s programs and pilot projects regarding housing, health and wellness, and sustainability are intended to address the factors that create stresses in the workplace. Benefits coverage demonstrates a commitment to the long-term health and care for employees. The UBC Statement on Respectful Environment for Students, Faculty and Staff, and numerous policies and processes to address injustices across UBC all support recourse for misconduct and create a sense of safety and greater retention. A Spiritual/Multi-Faith Space in the University Centre on the UBC Okanagan campus is successfully welcoming the diverse spiritual and multi-faith practices of students, staff, and faculty. Spirituality 101: Figuring out faith at UBC also helps students, staff, and faculty on the Vancouver campus understand where to access supports and prayer and meditation spaces.

---

One issue that surfaced in consultations regarding the housing and relocation programs was the design and regulation of the program based on the idea of a family consisting of two parents and children, with each child in a separate bedroom. For families from different cultures or who do not fit this stereotypical pattern, housing and relocation can be a challenge.

Childcare was also mentioned occasionally, most often by faculty members. The expansion of childcare services at UBC Vancouver was noted as contributing to work/life integration for families. For caregivers, primarily women, to be able to focus on their work and advance in their careers and contributions to the university, adequate childcare is essential\(^59\).

The Religious Holidays policy enables all students, faculty and staff members of UBC to observe the holy days of their religion, provided sufficient advance notice is given. Some units in UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan have created meditation/prayer spaces for observing religious traditions, however, this is not a consistent and/or widespread practice.

UBC’s Provost’s Office requires periodic external reviews of Faculties and Units to improve academic excellence and increase transparency. Terms of reference for these external reviews include attention to equity, though it may be that not all review teams fulfill the terms. Consultation meetings revealed one strategy to address this: representatives from the designated equity groups would like a half-hour group meeting with the external review team to ensure equity concerns were included.

Research grants, merit awards, and staff awards for exemplary service are based on objective criteria of a particular model of “excellence”. A review of federal-level data regarding awards and award amounts shows how gender biases are operating, and that it is likely that other systemic biases also impact success\(^60\). Steps to reduce this at the level of some funding


agencies are being taken. It is important that UBC, as a large institution with many grant applications, conference proposals, and applications for internal and external awards begins to track equity data along with applications and proposals to examine success rates in different arenas. For staff, representation among those receiving awards should also be tracked.

**Recognition, Awards, & Retention Recommendations:**

1. Learning from current pilot projects and expanding efforts to increase retention across campuses should be tracked to monitor what strategies work in which contexts, and for which employee groups.

2. Health & Wellbeing should work with Faculties/Units to create more meditation/prayer spaces for observing religious traditions, and more information about where those are found across UBC.

3. External Review teams include one meeting with Faculty/Unit representatives from designated equity groups to hear their perspectives on Faculty/Unit inclusion, and to ensure that terms of reference are respected and fulfilled in the review.

4. Immediate heads and other leaders, aware of the latest research on implicit biases among reviewers and applicants in funding agencies, can provide mentoring and proactive advising to ensure that applicants from designated equity groups are benefiting from this knowledge in formulating their applications and proposals.

**Termination & Retirement**

New dashboards have recently been developed with termination and retirement information for the four federally designated equity groups covering the last six years, by EEOG, term type, FTE, exit reason description, and age band. Reasons for exiting include termination, resignation, and retirement. Numbers were not sufficient to provide exit data for minority sexual orientations/gender identities.

Patterns in the data are based on comparing the rates of exits between the designated equity group and those not self-identifying as belonging to that group.

One impact of the end of mandatory retirement, perhaps in conjunction with the economic crisis of 2008, is that many existing faculty are remaining well beyond 65 years of age. As a result, fewer opportunities for turnover exist, particularly in smaller Departments. For 2017/18, retirements in the professoriate were higher for post-65 retirees and for regular retirements than they had been over the previous five years.

---

Men exit employment at UBC at higher rates than women for death, job abandonment, post 65 retirement, tenure denial, and lay-offs of full-time positions. Women in part-time positions, as compared to men in part-time positions, are more than twice as likely to exit because resources no longer exist. Women in full-time positions also consistently exit at higher rates than men.

People who self-identify as Aboriginal exit employment at higher rates than non-Aboriginal people across all EEOGs. People self-identifying as visible minorities tend to exit at lower rates than non-visible minority employees. For people self-identifying with disabilities the patterns were not as clear: since 2014 they are more likely to exit than those not self-identifying with a disability if in a part-time position, or if an EEOG other than senior managers, middle and other managers, and university teachers.

With the exit data, patterns reveal that women, people who self-identify as Aboriginal, and people self-identifying as having disabilities in non-leadership roles, are cycling through employment faster at UBC than other groups. Higher turnover among these designated equity groups could indicate a lack of inclusiveness in the workplace, although the data is unclear. It does mean a loss of human capital and of UBC’s investment in recruiting, hiring and training.

**Termination & Retirement Recommendations:**

1. More deans and heads of units should review and consider retention and termination data to clarify the cost of turnover, so that strategies for improvements can be tailored to that unit or faculty.

2. Implement an effective central exit interview process to better understand the reasons that people leave UBC.

**Conclusions**

UBC is in a unique position to shift employment systems to create more equity, inclusion, and innovation. UBC’s Vancouver campus is situated on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territories of the Musqueam people, and UBC’s Okanagan campus is situated on the territory of the Syilx Okanagan Nation and their peoples. This fundamental reminder of the historical legacy and inequities that have lead to our current system creates the “inescapable tension between this longing for transformative awakening and the sleepwalking selfhood of our habitual patterns”

Across the landscape of UBC’s employment systems there are many examples of new ideas and pilots being conducted to increase equity and inclusion. UBC has the institutional capacity to support their implementation, evaluation, and refinement through central units and research collaborations. Inclusion, like innovation, requires enough institutional structure and clarity of

---

purpose to allow disruptive ideas and experiments to fail and succeed, accepting the tension this creates and the possibilities for constructing new knowledge.

Data available shows different outcomes across designated equity groups at UBC. In addition to the data, perceptions of those interviewed for this report suggest that gendered areas of study, women’s “work” in the “housekeeping duties of maintaining the unit”, and women’s research and awards tend to be less well funded, while also indicating that women staff members have higher rates of turnover and may have some disparities in salary. People who self-identify as visible minorities are not proportionately represented in senior management, in spite of a large internal candidate pool. People self-identifying with disabilities are less represented within the data and often overlooked in equity discussions, making them more invisible on campus. People who self-identify as Aboriginal have very low representation at UBC except in senior positions. Women within designated equity groups may be more likely to experience barriers, though this needs to be more deeply examined as more data becomes available.

Employment systems in organizations and across society are shaped by culture and context: in an institution with 100 years of history, such as UBC, path dependency has been shaped by beliefs that are no longer held as common sense, but the legacy of these beliefs still influence the way things are done. Recognizing that current social and administrative patterns reinforce the normalization of particular advantages for particular groups, and disadvantages for other groups, requires UBC to critically examine how best to continue to intentionally interrupt those patterns. The cumulative impact of these societal and workplace patterns can be reinforced unconsciously, through tradition, path dependence, and hegemony, with designated equity groups experiencing the effects of this disadvantage. Continuing to address these disparities, perceived or otherwise, requires strongly supported systemic solutions that intentionally focus on equity and inclusion.

UBC has a strong workforce with many faculty and staff with both expertise and curiosity about how to make inclusive workplaces a reality, and some are already testing various ideas. It also has a very decentralized employment structure, with over 200 Faculties, Units and Departments. Opportunities for system-wide changes are different at the UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan campuses because of their different sizes and contexts. However, there is opportunity to develop strong research on what factors contribute to increasing inclusion. Piloting initiatives that can make changes at the individual, unit, and system level, critically and rigorously evaluating them, recognizing the promising efforts that currently exist, and developing new knowledge in this area is part of the university mission. UBC could be a pilot ship that leads Canadian higher education through some of these difficult passages, and develops rigorous, research-based expertise in this field.

Core Recommendations

1. UBC has a strong workforce with many faculty and staff with expertise and curiosity about how to make inclusive workplaces a reality and/or who are already testing
various ideas. Piloting initiatives that can make changes at the individual, unit, and system level, critically and rigorously evaluating them, recognizing promising efforts, and developing new knowledge in this area to share is part of the university mission. We should develop an Employment Equity Plan that can be an institutionally applied research project exploring promising practices to create more inclusion and equity in a research university, and acting as a model for wider society: include funding for pilots, research, validating accountability measures, communications, etc.

2. Ensure administrative heads of units are required to evaluate inclusion as a regular and frequent part of management reporting, supported by new capacities to provide data-driven decision-making at the unit level and supporting those in leadership roles to review and plan for improvements.

3. Develop, communicate, test, and refine a foundational strengths and skills framework for engaging diversity constructively, accompanied by a modular training program promoted for all employees at UBC.

4. Develop and implement an institutional policy/guidelines for accommodations to more effectively include people with disabilities in the workplace.

5. Ensure central support units have clear mandates, responsibilities, accountabilities, and resources to support continuous improvement to systems changes as they relate to creating a more diverse and inclusive workplace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Skinner</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Development &amp; Alumni Engagement, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Jordan</td>
<td>Managing Director, Strategic Initiatives, Learning &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>Human Resources, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Bayne</td>
<td>Managing Director of Faculty Relations</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Matacheskie</td>
<td>Managing Director of Faculty Relations</td>
<td>Faculty Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Perreault</td>
<td>Strategist for Indigenous Initiatives</td>
<td>Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anas Chaaban</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>School of Engineering, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Irvine</td>
<td>Professor / Unit 8 Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences, Unit 8, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Sali</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>Office Vice Principal, Research, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani Hosepyan</td>
<td>Assistant Dean. People &amp; Organizational Development, Human Resources</td>
<td>Sauder School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Forrest</td>
<td>BCGEU Staff Representative</td>
<td>Joint Union Management Committee (JUMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa Barnett</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences, Dean's Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Yim</td>
<td>Systems Management</td>
<td>Enrolment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Elchuk</td>
<td>HR Business Partner</td>
<td>Enrolment Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb Thomson</td>
<td>Director, Administration and Operations</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences, Dean's Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Hsiao</td>
<td>Director, HR &amp; Administration Staff</td>
<td>Faculty of Land and Food Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Momer</td>
<td>Associate Professor / Associate Dean</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences, Unit 1, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Taylor</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>AVP Students, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara Kirkey</td>
<td>Admin Assistant I</td>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor &amp; Principal Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleigh Benoit</td>
<td>Manager, Work Reintegration &amp; Accommodation Program</td>
<td>Human Resources, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carola Hibsch-Jetter</td>
<td>Manager, Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Science Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Higgs</td>
<td>Unit 6 History and Sociology Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences, Unit 6, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Pitman</td>
<td>Associate Director - Workplace Engagement &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Diel</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor &amp; Principal Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Simon</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>AVP Finance &amp; Operations, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Neid</td>
<td>IT Manager, Work Life Relocation, Faculty Staff Housing &amp; Relocation Services</td>
<td>Media &amp; Classroom Services, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Samuels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Lance</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>CUPE Local 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kitts</td>
<td>Professor (tenure) Associate</td>
<td>Faculty of Land and Food Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena Rubuliak</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Faculty Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane MacBride</td>
<td>Assistant to Deputy Registrar</td>
<td>Enrolment Services, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dory Nason</td>
<td>Senior Instructor, First Nations &amp; Indigenous and English</td>
<td>English Department / First Nations and Indigenous Studies Program (FNIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earllene Roberts</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences – UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Hornibrook</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Unit 7, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Kompauer</td>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Stirling</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>Finance, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans Van de Ven</td>
<td>Business Agent</td>
<td>CUPE 2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Athans</td>
<td>Senior Manager, Faculty and Employee Relations</td>
<td>Human Resources, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Vanderwoude</td>
<td>Assistant Dean, Facilities and Human Resources</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Doiron</td>
<td>Senior Business Manager, UBC Hiring Solutions</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gino DiLabio</td>
<td>Associate Professor / Unit 3 Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences – UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurdeep Parhar</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor, Family Practice Executive Associate Dean, Clinical Partnerships and Professionalism</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Quigley</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, Strategic Support Team</td>
<td>Athletics and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourik Khanlian</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilya Parkins</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences – UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Reiche</td>
<td>Director, HR</td>
<td>Unit 1, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Hensel</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
<td>Development &amp; Alumni Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Ferraro</td>
<td>HR Manager</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Mee</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Access &amp; Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janie McCallum</td>
<td>Assistant Dean, Human Resources</td>
<td>Science Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannah Jais</td>
<td>Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Generalist</td>
<td>AVP Students, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Love</td>
<td>Advisor on Women Faculty</td>
<td>Provost Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joey Hansen</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Association of Administrative &amp; Professional Staff (AAPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Braun</td>
<td>Unit 5 Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences Unit 5, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Klironomos</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences Unit 2, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai Li</td>
<td>Professor, Finance Division Senior Associate Dean</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ranalletta</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>CUPE 2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Whitehouse</td>
<td>Learning Services Assistant</td>
<td>Library Services, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Harrison</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Political Science Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattriona MacDonald</td>
<td>Senior Advisor to the Dean &amp; Chief Administrative Officer, Dean's Office</td>
<td>Sauder School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Kawa</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
<td>Office of the Vice-President, Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kele Fleming</td>
<td>Associate Director, Teaching and Learning Professional Development</td>
<td>Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Eaton</td>
<td>Program Lead, Occupational &amp; Preventive Health</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Golovin</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>School of Engineering, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korey Onyskevitch</td>
<td>Senior Employee Relations Manager</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Cacchioni</td>
<td>Senior Manager, Faculty and Employee Relations</td>
<td>Human Resources, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Schuppener</td>
<td>Faculty Administrator</td>
<td>Education - Dean's Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Fischer</td>
<td>Director, Advisory Services Managing Director, Strategic Staff Relations</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda McKnight</td>
<td>Director, Employee &amp; Labour Relations</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindi Frost</td>
<td>Manager, Planning &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Marshall</td>
<td>Manager, Planning &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Library Services, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Wright</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margot Young</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Allard School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Trowell</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>Faculty Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Brophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Housing &amp; Hospitality Services, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Train</td>
<td>Faculty Liaison Staff</td>
<td>Faculty of Land and Food Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Deyholos</td>
<td>Professor / Unit 2 Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences Unit 2, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Evans</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences Unit 1, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Berner</td>
<td>Managing Director, Total Compensation Director, Health, Wellbeing, &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Malloff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Kane</td>
<td>Support Services Assistant</td>
<td>Campus Planning &amp; Development, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninan Abraham</td>
<td>Professor / Associate Dean, Equity and Diversity</td>
<td>Zoology / Science Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrizia Todaro</td>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
<td>Office of the Vice-President Finance &amp; Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Davies</td>
<td>Unit Head</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences Unit 4, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooja Khandelwal</td>
<td>Career Navigation &amp; Transition Consultant</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger De Pieri</td>
<td>General Vice-President/Privacy Officer</td>
<td>CUPE Local 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roshni Narain</td>
<td>Human Rights Advisor</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Jarvis-Selinger</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor, Forest and Conservation Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gergel</td>
<td>Executive Director, Faculty Affairs, Deans Office, Human Resources</td>
<td>Forestry Faculty / Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepideh Pakpour</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>School of Engineering, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanda Jordan Gaetz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Staub-French</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Frohlick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences Unit 1, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvie Desjardins</td>
<td>Acting Associate Dean, Faculty and Academic Planning</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts &amp; Sciences Unit 5, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teija Wakeman</td>
<td>Manager, Administration</td>
<td>School of Engineering, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Jones</td>
<td>Human Resources Advisor</td>
<td>Human Resources, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Kavanagh</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences - Dean's Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Mohns</td>
<td>Faculty Administrator</td>
<td>Creative &amp; Critical Studes - Dean's Office, UBCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Lucet</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Irving K. Barber School of Arts and Sciences Unit 5, UBCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UBC statistical data for the Employment Systems Review comes from three main sources:

1. through a mandatory question regarding sex\(^{63}\) to register for benefits in the Human Resources Management System (HRMS);
2. through an ongoing employment equity survey (U Count at UBC); and
3. through the *Workplace Experiences Survey* (WES), which includes a section on demographic data.

The employment equity survey is confidential, but not anonymous. It is only to be used for employment equity programs and does not form part of the personnel file. Data is only available to designated personnel in the Equity & Inclusion Office and in Planning & Institutional Research. The WES is anonymous and confidential, and responses are gathered and aggregated by an external contractor and provided to UBC HR for analysis and programming.

There is clear information in each survey about how data will be aggregated for analysis and under what conditions, and with whom information will be shared. No information is shared that could identify individuals in the workplace from either survey. For this reason, data with respect to faculty and staff who may belong to more than one equity seeking group is rarely available, as the numbers are generally too small. In accordance with UBC practice, numbers under five are not reported. Self-selection bias is an issue in both survey data sets.

**Employment Equity Reporting**

Regular reporting is provided based on these surveys. Each year, in accordance with the Canadian *Employment Equity Act*, UBC completes an *Employment Equity Report*, which compares the current representation of designated equity groups to the available workforce data provided by the federal government (currently from 2011) for both campuses: UBC-Vancouver (UBC-V), and UBC-Okanagan (UBC-O). In all reporting on designated equity groups, data is withheld for fewer than five respondents. Available workforce data is stratified federally by Employment Equity Occupational Groups (EEOGs). A description of the positions that fall into each category follows\(^ {64}\):

---

\(^{63}\) UBC is in the process of updating its Human Resources Management System to provide the option for more choices than male/female in the personnel records of employees.

UBC also publishes its yearly Focus on People: Benchmark Report, which examines senior level categories in more detail to assess employment equity on both campuses. In recent years, “equity dashboards” have been created from the employment equity data that can examine representation, promotion, and salary trends among tenure stream faculty for inequities.
Workplace Experiences Reporting

The Workplace Experiences Survey (WES) is repeated every three years to examine employee engagement and experiences. This data can be presented across UBC as a whole, or differentiated by the two campuses, among designated equity groups, among employee unions and groups, and within workplace units (if a large enough sample of employees (10 or more) within a unit responded to the survey).

The purpose of the WES is to measure faculty and staff engagement, which affects initiative and discretionary effort in the workplace, ability to do their best work, and contributions to the overall success of UBC. The Employment Systems Review examines engagement drivers which are influenced by, or influence, employment systems. For staff and faculty, these engagement drivers are Professional Growth, UBC’s Senior Leadership, and Inclusion & Respect. The ordering of these is slightly different for each group.

For UBC faculty, the regression analysis done for factors that increase overall engagement provides the following:

---

The factors that most influence faculty engagement in the workplace, in order of importance, are Professional Growth, UBC’s Senior Leadership, Student Focus, and Inclusion & Respect.

For staff members, the regression analysis for drivers of engagement revealed the following:

The top influences for staff members’ workplace engagement are Professional Growth, Inclusion & Respect, UBC’s Senior Leadership, and Student Focus.

Feedback on the WES results can be provided to each unit, if there were at least 10 participants from that unit to provide anonymity. Depending on participation rates, unit level WES data disaggregated by designated equity groups may be more difficult obtain.

Pulse Surveys can be conducted more frequently in particular units wishing to examine current climate as a result of changes from the WES.

As with the employment equity survey, self-selection bias and small sample sizes mean that statistical significance tests are not possible, and this presents an issue in interpreting the results. The data presented is descriptive only. However, that does not mean there is no useful information in the data, or that “perfect” data is required to make changes that can be evaluated for their effect in moving in a desired direction.

UBC is also currently implementing an Integrated Renewal Program to update its human resources management and payroll systems. This provides an opportunity to examine what equity data is most useful for decision-making at different levels in the institutions, and includes
reviews of unit-level equity data for applicant pools, hiring, professional development, promotions, tenure, retention and awards, and exits.

Self-Selection Bias

As noted above, self-selection bias is a concern with both surveys. Self-identification of women and men in the employment equity survey can be compared to the HRMS to see if the bias in the responses is statistically significant. That comparison reveals that it is likely we can rely on the data; however, it should be noted that the HRMS only provides M/F data. For other FCP designated equity groups, the only objective external measure provided for comparative purposes is the 2011 Canadian Available Workforce data provided based on the 2011 Canadian Household Census. For UBC’s fifth designated equity group, people who identify with minority sexual orientations and/or gender identities, there is no comparable data source. Where possible in the Employment Systems Review, data was also compared to peer Canadian research universities.

It is important to recognize that there are many reasons why someone would choose either to respond or ignore an equity survey. Requiring self-identification is not an institutional option. It is also important to recognize that the perspective for the analysis of data in this report is to

---

UBC is in the process of updating its Human Resources Management System to provide the option for more choices than male/female in the personnel records of employees.
discover patterns of inequity for members of designated equity groups. These patterns are revealed by the quantitative data from the EES and the WES.

Validity and Reliability of the Data

Self-selection bias and small sample sizes raise questions about the representativeness of the data that is obtained through either survey, and whether decisions should be made based on it. Yet, the trends evident in the EES data and the WES data were also confirmed through the consultations.

There is also extensive research based on valid and reliable measures that demonstrates that inequities exist in our society.

Inequities may occur for a variety of reasons, but this review focuses on those that may be possible to eliminate or mitigate through changes in employment systems. While the UBC evidence will be imperfect as a result of self-selection bias, larger societal patterns provide a level of confidence that it can be used to support decision-making. In the Canadian context, the principle of substantive equality means that initiatives to mitigate systemic inequities are recognized as fair.
Equity Survey for Canada Research Chair Applicants

Why are you being asked to complete this survey?
UBC is committed to employment equity and inclusion. This survey helps UBC understand how successful we have been in diversifying our applicant pool for Canada Research Chairs and how to enhance inclusive, equitable, and transparent merit-based selection processes. The questions in this survey are primarily based on terminology used by Statistics Canada as well as the Employment Equity Act of Canada.

How will the information collected in this survey be used?
Survey responses will be used by UBC to ensure that there is diversity in the candidate pool and to ensure the hiring of members of the following designated groups: persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, visible minorities, and women.

Do you have to complete this survey?
Yes, under new requirements for the Canada Research Chair Program, you must complete the survey to be considered for nomination to a CRC position. Only candidates who have self-identified as a person with a disability, an Indigenous person, a racialized person/member of a visible minority, and/or a woman are eligible for this search process.

Do you have to identify yourself?
Yes, you must provide your name to be eligible for this search process. If you choose not to provide your name, your survey results will not be connected to your application and will simply form part of our aggregate statistics. Your application will be eliminated from the search process.

How will your privacy be protected?
Your personal information is collected under the authority of sections 26(a) and 26(c) of the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. The information you provide will not form part of your personnel file and will only be used to determine whether you qualify for participation in this hiring process. Data will be collected by the Equity & Inclusion Office and only your name as someone who is a member of a designated group will be shared with the search committee. No details of how you identify will be shared except in the case of searches which are limited to one of the designated groups and this will be explicit in the job advertisement. Your responses will be stored in a secure database. Questions about the collection and use of the information may be forwarded to the AVP, Equity & Inclusion in the Equity & Inclusion Office.
Title of CRC Position: _______________________________________

Gender
Select the option that you identify with.

- Woman
- Man
- Gender-fluid, non-binary, and/or Two-Spirit
- I prefer not to answer

Indigenous Identity
Do you identify as Indigenous; that is First Nations (North American Indian), Métis or Inuit?

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer

If "Yes", select the options with which you identify:

- First Nations
- Inuit
- Métis
- I prefer not to answer
Disabilities
Do you identify as a person with a disability?

Note: Person with a disability is a person who has a long-term or recurring physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric or learning impairment and:
1. Who considers themselves to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment, or
2. Who believes that an employer or potential employer is likely to consider them to be disadvantaged in employment by reason of that impairment, and
3. Whose functional limitations owing to their impairment may have been accommodated in their current job or workplace, or who may require an accommodation in a future job or workplace

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ I prefer not to answer

Visible Minorities
Do you identify as a member of a visible minority in Canada?

(Note: visible minority refers to whether a person belongs to a visible minority group as defined by the Employment Equity Act and, if so, the visible minority groups to which the person belongs. The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are ... non-white in colour.")

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ I prefer not to answer

Please provide your name here:
Default Question Block

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your participation in this comparative review is essential to ensure compliance with the Canada Research Chair Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan. Your responses will be aggregated to report on our requirement for transparency in allocation, selection, and renewal as well as whether UBC is meeting its institutional equity and diversity targets[1]. Your responses will also provide baseline information.

If you have more than one chairholder reporting to you in full or in part, you will be required to fill out one complete survey for each chairholder. For chairholders who report to you in part, please respond with what your department/unit provides to the chairholder only. Please fill this out for active chairholders as of October 31, 2018.


Your Name:

Your Administrative Title:

Faculty:

Academic Unit, if applicable (e.g., Dept. of Psychology, School of Kinesiology, Dept. of Chemistry, etc.)

Chairholder's Name:
Chairholder's Employee ID #:

Which Tier?
- Tier I
- Tier II

Chairholder's Title:

Chairholder's Field of Research:

Does the Chairholder have a joint appointment?
- Yes
- No

If yes, what proportion of the appointment belongs to your unit?

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Click to write Choice 1

If in part, with which other academic unit(s)?

Assigned square metres for office space:
Does this chairholder also have a laboratory?

☐ Yes

☐ No

**Please Note:** In your answer to the following questions, please distinguish dedicated space - laboratory area reserved exclusively for the chairholder and their research associates (undergraduate research assistants, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, et al.) from shared space - laboratory area used on a regular basis by the chairholder and other researchers in your academic unit. Please provide a separate estimate of each category of space (dedicated versus shared).

If Yes, dedicated assigned square metres for laboratory (if applicable):

If Yes, shared assigned square metres for laboratory (if applicable):

Protected time for research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Percentage of workload:

**Please Note:** In your answer to the following questions, please distinguish dedicated equipment - apparatus reserved exclusively for the chairholder and their research associates (undergraduate research assistants, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, et al.) from shared equipment - apparatus used regularly by the chairholder and other researchers in your academic unit.

Dedicated research equipment provided - please describe in full:
Shared research equipment provided - please describe in full:

Please specify the funding provided from your budget to this chairholder:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student salaries and benefits (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student salary and benefits (Postdoctoral and other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services / contracts (including lab support or technicians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs for DEDICATED laboratory space (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs for SHARED laboratory space (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other institutional research funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, supplies and other expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support related to the Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATED Research Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARED Research Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe any non-monetary support provided by your department in support of this chair.

Is there a mentoring policy/program for your department/unit?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
If Yes, please provide details:

Has your department/unit assigned a mentor to this chairholder?

○ Yes
○ No

Thank you for completing this survey. As a community, we are committed to meeting, and where possible exceeding, requirements related to equity, diversity and inclusion. This is an important tool to ensure that we achieve the objectives of the CRC Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Action Plan, and essential to supporting the continuation of our CRCs by the Canadian government. If you have any questions, please contact Linda Leathley at VP Academic UBCCRC <ubcypao-gubccrc@mail.ubc.ca>.

This survey forms part of a comparative review of the CRCs at UBC, and the results of this survey and other review mechanisms will be released in the comparative review report.

Thank you.
Default Question Block

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Your participation in this comparative review is essential to ensure compliance with the Canada Research Chair Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan. This information is gathered under FIPPA s.26 (c), (d), and (e), and is necessary for the purposes of planning and evaluation for the institution.

This survey has two sections: one to understand your assessment of the institutional support to your chair, and one to explore your perceptions of workplace climate.

Your responses will not be shared with your dean or department head, and will be confidential to the Office of the Provost and the Equity & Inclusion Office. Responses will be aggregated to report on our requirement for transparency in allocation, selection, and renewal of CRCs, as well as whether UBC is meeting its institutional equity and diversity targets[1]. Your responses will also provide baseline information. Please fill this out by December 5th, 2018.


Your Name:

Employee ID #:

Your Academic Title:

Faculty:
Academic Unit, if applicable (e.g., Dept. of Psychology, School of Kinesiology, Dept. of Chemistry, etc.)

Title of the Chair:

Which Tier?
- Tier I
- Tier II

Your Field of Research:

Do you have a joint faculty appointment?
- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide the first academic unit's name:

Please indicate the proportion of your appointment belonging to this academic unit:

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Click to write Choice 1

Please indicate with which other academic unit(s)?
Have you been provided with adequate office space?

- Yes
- No. Please explain:

Have you been provided with adequate research space?

- Yes
- No. Please explain:

Do you have protected time for research?

- Yes
- No

If yes, protected time for research:

Percentage of workload:

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Have you been provided with adequate research equipment by your department?

- Yes
- No. Please explain:

Have you been provided with adequate access to graduate students/post docs to assist with your research?

- Yes
- No. Please explain
What other supports (monetary/non-monetary) have been provided for the term of this chair:

- Professional and technical services / contracts (including lab support or technicians) [ ] [ ]
- Operating costs for laboratory space (if applicable): [ ] [ ]
- Other institutional research funding [ ] [ ]
- Materials, supplies and other expenditures [ ] [ ]
- Administrative support related to the Chair [ ] [ ]
- Travel [ ] [ ]
- Research Equipment [ ] [ ]
- Other (please describe): [ ]

Are there essential supports from your department that you are missing?

- Yes. Please explain: [ ]
- Maybe. Please explain: [ ]
- No [ ]

Is there a mentoring policy/program for your department/unit?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

If Yes, please provide details:

[ ]

Has your department/unit assigned a mentor to you?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
Which of the following issues are barriers to you in achieving your career aspirations at UBC? (Please select all that apply.)

☐ I am not given the opportunity to acquire the skills required to advance my career
☐ I do not have the qualifications required to advance my career
☐ I have not run into any barriers trying to achieve my career aspirations at UBC
☐ Lack of unit head's support
☐ Lack of mentor to support my career objectives
☐ My age
☐ My disability
☐ My ethnic or cultural origin
☐ My religious affiliation
☐ My sex
☐ My sexual orientation
☐ My gender identity
☐ My workload
☐ My responsibilities at home and outside of work
☐ Other (please specify): ________________________________

Please explain further, if applicable:

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>N/A, No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in my workplace.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My diversity is valued in my workplace.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how I can contribute to a respectful workplace.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People treat each other with respect and consideration in my workplace.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my workplace, differences of opinion are handled in a respectful manner.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC has effective policies and practices for addressing inappropriate behaviour.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am part of a community at UBC.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could your workplace environment be improved?
Thank you for completing this survey. As a community, we are committed to meeting, and where possible exceeding, requirements related to equity, diversity and inclusion. This is an important tool to ensure that we achieve the objectives of the CRC Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Action Plan, and essential to supporting the continuation of our CRCs by the Canadian government.

Please contact Linda Leathley at VP Academic UBCCRC <ubcvpao-g-ubccrc@mail.ubc.ca>, with any questions.

This survey forms part of a comparative review of the CRCs at UBC, and the results of this survey and other review mechanisms will be released in the comparative review report.

Thank you.
Step-by-Step CRC Appointment File Guide
(previously Appointments Checklist)

This guide is designed as a step-by-step guide search for a Canada Research Chair at UBC and to fulfill the requirements of the CRC Program and UBC’s CRC Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Action Plan. It will also enable search committee chairs to complete the Attestation – Recruitment & Nomination Process Form to attest to the integrity of the process and adherence to the requirements.

Please review this Appointment File Guide in its entirety before beginning your search process, as the CRC Program nominations process has changed. Until further notice, nominations to the CRCP are restricted to individuals who self-identify as belonging to one or more of the federally designated equity groups to redress the imbalance of representation within the CRCP.

The Tri-Agency Institutional Programs Secretariat (TIPS) reserves the right to ask institutions to provide, at any time within 48 months following nomination submission, the documentation that demonstrates that the requirements were followed.

I. Prior to Active Recruitment

1) Analyze your Faculty’s needs and determine the diversity presently amongst your CRC Tier 1 and 2 chairs by contacting UBC’s CRC Secretariat at ubcvpa0-g-ubccrc@mail.ubc.ca. Consider under-explored or under-examined areas of research, learning, and knowledge within this discipline.

2) Further to our previous communications regarding changes to the Canada Research Chair Program (CRCP) requirements from Ottawa, please be advised that with the 2019 Addendum to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement, new employment equity targets are being set for representation across the Canada Research Chair Program. These targets will be implemented over the next 10 years, and are based on the newly released 2016 Canadian Workforce Availability data. These targets and any new requirements from the CRCP will be published in the spring of 2020. For UBC, as a large institution, targets will be disaggregated between Tier 1 and Tier 2, rather than considered together. For additional information on the 2019 Addendum, its implementation and the Program’s current EDI measures, please see the frequently asked questions.

3) When filling a chair, your Faculty must consider the need to meet and sustain current equity and diversity targets to address the underrepresentation of chairholders from the Four Designated Groups (FDG) which are women, visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized), persons with disabilities, and Indigenous peoples. Consider the intersectionality of identities in discussing CRC positions.

Developed by the Vice-Provost and Vice-President, Academic; and the Equity & Inclusion Office, with thanks to reference materials from the University of Toronto, University of Victoria, McMaster University, etc.
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4) Please note: in accordance with the latest CRCP communications, peer review of any new nominations will almost certainly be withheld if the nominated candidate does not further UBC's efforts to ensure employment equity among its Canada Research Chair program. It is essential that the language provided in this guide be used in your position advertisements to ensure that all potential candidates are clear that these positions are restricted to candidates self-identifying as belonging to one of the federally designated equity groups: women, visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized), persons with disabilities, and Indigenous peoples.

II. The Recruitment Process

A. Advertisements

1) Place the advertisement in accordance with UBC Policy #20: Advertising of Position Vacancies. Please refer to the advertising guidelines on our website. Ensure that the advertisement is posted for a minimum 30 days.

2) Create a CRC posting that encourages applications from excellent candidates belonging to designated equity groups. Ensure that the advertisement is clear that nominations will be restricted to chairholders from traditionally under-represented groups, and in particular, include the language from the 2019 Addendum to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement:

“In accordance with UBC’s CRC Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion Action Plan, and pursuant to Section 42 of the BC Human Rights code, the selection will be restricted to members of the following designated groups: women, visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized), persons with disabilities, and Indigenous peoples. Applicants to Canada Research Chair positions are asked to complete this equity survey as part of the application, and candidates from these groups must self-identify as belonging to one or more of the designated equity groups to be considered for the position. Because the search is limited to those self-identifying as members of designated equity groups, candidates must also provide their name to be considered.

Personal information is collected under the authority of sections 26(a) and 26(c) of the BC Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. The information you provide will only be used to determine whether you qualify for participation in this hiring process. Data will be collected by the Equity & Inclusion Office and only the names of those who identify as women, visible minorities (member of groups that are racially categorized) and/or Indigenous peoples will be shared with the search committee. Currently, UBC has a gap in representation for people with disabilities. Until such time as this is remedied, the names of those self-identifying as having a disability will be provided separately to the search committee. Responses will be stored in a secure database.”

Please note that this equity survey reproduces the CRCP survey from Ottawa to provide comparable data, however, it uses outdated language and does not represent the way that these questions are asked in other equity surveys at UBC. If you have questions, please contact the Equity & Inclusion Office.
For more information about Restricted Hiring, please refer to the FAQs on our CRC website [LINK].

3) Advertisements for Tier 2 Chairs should also contain the following information:

"Tier 2 Chairs are intended for exceptional emerging scholars (i.e., candidates must have been an active researcher in their field for fewer than 10 years at the time of nomination). Applicants who are more than 10 years from having earned their highest degree (and where career breaks exist, such as maternity, parental or extended sick leave, clinical training, etc.) may have their eligibility for a Tier 2 Chair assessed through the program’s Tier 2 justification process."

Further information on this process can be found here – Tier 2 Justification Process.

4) As per UBC Policy 20: Advertising of Position Vacancies all advertisements must include the following:

"Equity and diversity are essential to academic excellence. An open and diverse community fosters the inclusion of voices that have been underrepresented or discouraged. We encourage applications from members of groups that have been marginalized on any grounds enumerated under the B.C. Human Rights Code, including sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, racialization, disability, political belief, religion, marital or family status, age, and/or status as a First Nation, Metis, Inuit, or Indigenous person."

5) Accommodations during interview process: UBC has committed to supporting accommodations for CRCs through a pilot for centralized accommodations funding. This includes accommodation expenses (if any) during the interviewing process. Ensure that all advertisements include the following:

"UBC welcomes and encourages applications from people with disabilities. Accommodations are available on request for all candidates taking part in all aspects of the selection process. To confidentially request accommodations, please contact ** at ***(phone) or ***(email)."

[Please complete with the name and contact details of the administrator supporting the interviewing process.]

To support the administrator’s ability to provide necessary accommodations appropriately, there is a FAQ section on the CRC website [LINK], as well as additional training/resource information available through the HR Advisor (UBCV & UBCO) or the Equity & Inclusion Office (UBCV & UBCO).

6) Many units are requesting diversity statements (like a teaching or research statement) from applicants. Consider including a statement similar to the following:

In UBC’s Strategic Plan: Shaping UBC’s Next Century, inclusion, innovation, and collaboration have been identified as our key themes. We welcome colleagues with the experiences and skills to contribute to our principles of inclusion, equity, and diversity throughout campus life. Please tell us about your strengths and experiences in increasing equity, diversity, and inclusion in your previous institutional environment, in curriculum, and in supporting diverse students."
7) To attract and secure the best possible candidates, use the objective, measurable criteria established earlier when listing qualifications in your advertisements, with the relative weighting of importance determining the ordering of criteria.

8) If your Faculty would like a review of the language in your posting to support its success in attracting excellent candidates from diverse backgrounds, please contact the Equity & Inclusion Office (info@equity.ubc.ca) prior to posting.

9) Final drafts of all advertisements must be submitted to ubc.crc@ubc.ca before they are passed to Faculty Relations through the Position Management process. Final approval will be provided by the Provost’s Office.

10) A copy of the chair posting/advertisement must be included with all nominations submitted to the CRC program for peer review. Nominations that do not provide evidence of an openly advertised process, with transparent and open language about the restricted nomination program, will not be accepted by the program – this applies to all recruitment, retention, advancement, and foreign nominations.

11) Publicly advertise all Chair positions on UBC’s public accountability web page for a minimum of 30 days prior to the closing of the competition (this applies to all new nominations, even those open only to existing faculty).

12) Clearly indicate the date initially posted in the job posting, and be aware that in keeping with transparency, a job posting may be advertised no more than two years prior to the nomination being put forward to TIP.

13) On the day the chair position is posted online, please send links of all job postings to ubc.crc@ubc.ca, who will ensure it is forwarded to CRCP.

B. Special efforts to attract the attention of qualified candidates among the four designated equity groups

1) Consider networks that researchers in the Faculty (and beyond) may have to reach potential candidates from among underrepresented groups, and develop a strategy to strengthen or develop those networks.

2) Review and develop networks among academics and research areas of focus that include members of the four designated equity groups for this and future searches at UBC.

3) Post advertisements in specialized journals, newspapers, list serves etc., directed to persons with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, racialized people and/or women.

4) Write letters and other communications targeted to members of these groups.

5) Encourage personal networking targeted to members of these groups.

6) Facilitate measures to ensure the candidate pool is sufficiently large.
III. The Selection Process

C. The Search Committee

1) Establish your search committee with consideration for the diversity of the committee members. Consider asking underrepresented faculty, particularly those currently underrepresented among CRCs, to participate in the search committee. Be mindful of workload and any imbalance in other requests for underrepresented faculty to participate in committees, etc., in comparison with their colleagues.

2) TIPS and the CRC EDI Action Plan require that all search committee members receive training on equity and diversity in the search process. Please contact your Associate Dean with responsibility for equity or the Equity & Inclusion Office (info@equity.ubc.ca) to arrange a workshop.

3) With the search committee: establish objective, measurable criteria for this CRC position, and weight each criterion’s relative importance. Consider criteria that includes assessment of a candidate’s equity, diversity, and inclusion skills and their ability to work with diverse colleagues. The CRCP provides this guidance. “Require, as part of the job criteria, a track record related to EDI. Encourage applicants to identify their strengths and experiences in increasing EDI in their previous institutional environment, and in curriculum, and in supporting diverse students”.

4) Ensure that the selection committee chair and members understand their roles in the selection process and their roles as representatives of the University.

5) Confirm that all selection committee members understand how applicant pool data is collected and used, and its purpose in supporting equitable hiring.

6) Confirm that all selection committee members have received equitable recruitment training within the last two years.

7) In order to comply with provincial Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FIPPA) and Human Rights legislation, all members of the selection committee should ensure an objective and transparent process.

D. Documentation During Recruitment and Selection Process

1) Keep a factual record of the recruitment and selection process. Include copies of advertisements as well as descriptions of special measures to recruit members of the designated groups. Should human rights groups or government agencies inquire about your recruitment and selection procedures, you may be required to produce evidence that your hiring process was fair. Also, candidates may request access to records relating to them under the Freedom of Information process. Records must be kept for a period of one year from the time of the interview and should be filed in a secure place. In addition, if the successful candidate is a foreign academic, records must be kept for six years from date of hire.
2) The Equity & Inclusion Office will track the success of your proactive recruitment strategies through the applicant employment equity survey data and upon request to ubc.crc@ubc.ca provide a confidential report to the search committee as soon as they are notified that the search process is closed.

E. Reviewing Applications and Shortlisting

1) Prior to reviewing any applications, please contact the CRC Secretariat at ubc.crc@ubc.ca to receive details of your applicant pool data.

   You will be provided with a breakdown of the proportion of applicants who have self-identified in each of the equity categories and the names of those candidates eligible to be considered.

   Because of UBC's current equity targets, the names of all candidates self-identifying with a disability will be provided to ensure that they are immediately placed on the longlist.

   Those applications from people who have not self-identified are not eligible for nomination.

   In cases where a particular position is restricted to one designated equity group because of the equity targets, your candidate pool will only include those people.

2) When submitting the appointment file to the Provost's Office, please provide an explanation as to why each of the candidates who have indicated they have a disability were not shortlisted.

3) Review and evaluate every applicant against the previously established, weighted criteria that are job-relevant, objective, and measurable. Best practices dictate that every selection committee member review every application.

4) Establish your longlist of candidates based on those who meet the minimum advertised qualifications. From this pool, derive your interview shortlist. Departments must be able to document and justify the way in which they developed the shortlist. It is suggested that selection committee members frame the shortlist as those who they feel should be invited to an interview, rather than those who should not be included.

5) As with all shortlisting processes, review the applications to ensure the list does not reflect bias. One example of bias that may show up in shortlisting is stereotypical assumptions about the importance of an uninterrupted work record. These assumptions often disadvantage women, persons with disabilities, or recent immigrants. Ask yourself: is an uninterrupted work record a valid test of a candidate's ability to meet the requirements of a position? Other assumptions that may lead to bias may need to be discussed and reviewed among the selection committee.
F. The Interview

1) Prior to the interview, develop a set of questions based on stated criteria and ask all candidates, including internal ones, the same questions. Ensure that questions assess criteria that can be evaluated objectively.

2) Ensure that the offer to provide any necessary accommodations for the interview process is included in any email communications to set up the interviews [see above and FAQs on our website]:

   “Accommodations are available on request for candidates taking part in all aspects of the selection process. To make a confidential request for accommodations, please contact ** at **(phone) or **(email).”

   [To be completed by the department setting up the interviews.]

3) Discuss each candidate in turn as interviews take place. Set aside time after each interview for a discussion.

4) When selecting the top candidate, focus the discussion on the weighted criteria for the Chair. Encourage selection committee members to ground this discussion in examples from the interview or from the application.

IV. Finalizing the Appointment

1) Before finalizing the appointment, ensure that the successful candidate is provided with information and/or links to information about the range of institutional supports for comparable chairs based on the annual comparative review, in accordance with UBC’s CRC Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Action Plan and the CRCP requirements.

2) The CRCP Nomination Attestation Form should be requested from ubcvpao-r-ubccrc@mail.ubc.ca. Once completed, it is returned to the same.

3) UBC Human Resources provides detailed Appointments Checklists for New Tenure/Tenure Track Appointments. All forms and materials should be completed and submitted to Faculty Relations.

4) Upon acceptance of the position by the successful candidate, notify the UBC CRC Secretariat via email at ubc.crc@ubc.ca.
FAQs - Restricted & Preferential Hiring in the Canada Research Chair Program at UBC

Context
The Canada Research Chair Program has announced that nominations for new chair positions will not be peer reviewed, except in the case where a nomination involves someone who has self-identified within one or more of the following federally designated groups: women, visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized), persons with disabilities, and Indigenous peoples, unless the university nominating is within 10% of achieving each of its equity targets for proportional representation of the federally designated groups as of 2017. Therefore, UBC is currently in a period of restricted recruitment, selection, and nomination for Canada Research Chairs until it can achieve, and continue to achieve, those targets.

In May 2017, the Canadian Research Chair Program (CRCP) advised universities that there was a need for greater transparency and accountability in the processes used to allocate, select, and support chairholders to ensure that institutional equity and diversity targets were met. With over 200 Canadian Research Chairs (CRCs), UBC has developed the CRC Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Action Plan (EDIAP) to address any inequities that are currently experienced by individuals and to ensure greater transparency in the allocation, selection, and renewal processes for chairholders. For more information about the EDIAP, see UBC’s Commitment to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion within the CRC Program.

On July 31, 2019, the Tri-agency Institutional Programs Secretariat released an Addendum to the 2006 Canadian Human Rights Settlement Agreement. This Addendum outlines a number of measures that will be implemented in the Canada Research Chairs Program over the coming years. In addition, Employment and Social Development Canada published Canadian Workforce Availability data for the last three census years on June 27, 2019, including national data for designated equity groups: women, visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized), persons with disabilities, and Indigenous peoples.

As of September 2019, UBC is not meeting equity targets for representation of persons with disabilities among the 2017 targets established for Canada Research Chairs. With updated equity targets (expected in April 2020), the fluctuation of people in the program, and the disaggregation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 chairs, UBC will have a deficit in representation for all four equity groups.

Within a restricted hiring process, preferential hiring can also be used — and in UBC’s context this strategy will be focused to address significant under-representation among particular equity groups. Restricted and/or preferential hiring at the University of British Columbia are strategies that are being implemented to help address systemic under-representation experienced by individuals within the CRCP. These strategies are implemented in accordance with the BC Human Rights Tribunal special programs.

What is restricted hiring?
In a restricted hiring competition, only applicants who have self-identified as belonging to one or more of the equity groups designated for the restricted hiring process will be considered for the position. For the Canada Research Chair Program, there are four federally designated groups:

- Women
- Visible minorities (members of groups that are racially categorized)
- People with disabilities
- Indigenous peoples

Can I preferentially hire within a restricted hiring program?
It is possible to preferentially hire within a restricted hiring process. In a preferential hiring competition, specific equity groups are preferred (e.g. persons with disabilities). Qualified applicants who have self-identified as belonging to that specific designated equity group will be preferred. For instance, in a restricted hiring process we will only consider the applications of those who have self-identified in at least one of the four designated groups. Additionally, if we need to address a specific area of under-representation (e.g. persons with disabilities), applications from individuals identifying as having a disability would be considered first.

If none of the preferentially considered applicants (in our example, persons with disabilities) are successful, qualified applicants who are from other designated group(s) will then be short-listed and assessed. Under the current Canada Research Chair Program, this means that only after considering applicants who have self-identified from the preferentially designated group would applicants from other designated groups be considered.

When does UBC conduct restricted or preferential hiring competitions?1
Restricted or preferential hiring may be implemented under one or more of the following conditions:
- There is a serious under-representation of a designated equity group in the relevant unit, occupation, or program and it is expected that there will be few opportunities in the near future to address this under-representation.
- Other attempts to reach equitable representation through an equity plan or other means have not been sufficient.
- External funding programs require that equity and diversity targets or commitments be met.
- A program requires the special expertise or knowledge of members of a designated group.
- It is a strategic decision to develop a broad range of perspectives to build diverse scholarship and work at the university.
- The university requires diverse leaders and faculty members to support diverse students and staff envisioning leadership roles for their own futures.

What is UBC’s process for restricted hiring?
As outlined in the CRC Appointments Guide, in a restricted hiring process, only those who have completed an Applicant Equity Survey in which they self-identified as belonging to one or more of the designated equity groups, and provided their names, are eligible to be considered for the position.

What happens if no one from a designated equity group applies or is qualified to be shortlisted?
In a restricted hiring competition, if no one from the designated equity group(s) applies, or if no one from the designated equity group(s) who applies is successfully short-listed, the job posting must stay open until a qualified candidate from the designated equity group(s) has applied and been successful.

Do all applicants have to agree to self-identify and to provide their names in a restricted hiring process?
No. Applicants do not need to self-identify in any way if they choose not to. However, only candidates who self-identify as belonging to one or more of the designated equity groups and provide their names can be considered.

---

1 Adapted from Uvic’s policy of preferential/limited hiring at:
https://www.uvic.ca/universitysecretary/assets/docs/policies/HR6110_3100_.pdf

(01222505;1)
FAQs - Accommodations During the Hiring Process

What do I do if someone requests accommodation during the hiring process?
A candidate may ask for accommodation at any point during the hiring process. The purpose of an accommodation is to help remove barriers and allow the candidate to be properly assessed on the essential duties of the position.

Requests are typically simple and inexpensive to accommodate, and can vary according to the candidate’s needs.

What kind of accommodations might someone ask for?
Accommodation requests could look like:
- Ensuring that the interview space is accessible.
- Using video conferencing instead of a phone interview.
- Access to gender-neutral washrooms.
- Hiring a sign language interpreter or a captioner.
- Scheduling the interview later in the day and/or scheduling a longer interview period that provides time for breaks.
- Access to a breast-feeding space.

What are UBC’s responsibilities to provide accommodations to a candidate during the interview process?
According to UBC’s Employment Equity (Policy #2):
“The University of British Columbia has established a program of employment equity to provide a fair and equitable workplace and to offer all individuals full opportunity to develop their potential. Accordingly, the University will identify and eliminate any discriminatory barriers that interfere with employment opportunities in all jobs and at all levels throughout the University. Both current and prospective faculty and staff will receive equitable treatment in hiring, training, and promotion procedures.”

UBC has an obligation to accommodate candidates, and failure to provide reasonable accommodations is discrimination.

What if I’m not sure an accommodation request is ‘reasonable’?
Under the BC Human Rights Code, an accommodation request must not present “undue hardship” to take steps to grant it. If you have any questions or concerns about how to appropriately provide accommodations during the hiring process, please contact the Human Rights Advisor at the Equity and Inclusion Office.

Sources:
UBC’s Employment Equity Policy (Policy #2)
UBC’s Discrimination Policy (Policy #3)
Disability and Accommodation under British Columbia Employment Law
Canadian Research Chairs: Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; A Best Practices Guide for Recruitment, Hiring and Retention
Canada Research Chair Retention Form

Whenever a currently occupied Canada Research Chair (CRC) is being vacated (owing to an unsuccessful nomination, the end of the Chair's second term, or some other reason), and the cognizant Faculty seeks to retain that Chair, then the responsible Dean must complete this form and return it to the Provost Office for consideration. Note that a denial of Chair retention may be due to an overall adjustment to the University's CRC allocation, an imbalance in the internal Chair distribution, or lack of a clear or compelling case for retaining the Chair.

Faculty/Academic Unit (e.g., Arts/History):

_________________________________________________________

Area of Research (for inclusion in posting):

_________________________________________________________

Type of Nomination: [ ] External Search [ ] Internal Search

Name of Current Chair Holder:

_________________________________________________________

Name of Person Leading the Search Committee:

_________________________________________________________

On the remainder of this page and continuing on page 2, provide the rationale for retaining the Chair by:

- clarifying the Chair's expected contributions to the Faculty/Unit;
- explaining how the Faculty/Unit will support the Chair's research efforts.
- discussing how the Faculty will address the under representation of the four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, and members of visible minorities) among Chairholders at the Tier 1 or Tier 2 levels;
- if applicable, justifying the search for an internal instead of an external candidate.
By signing this form, the Faculty confirms that, if this request is approved, the selection process will follow CRC Program requirements for Chair recruitment and nomination, with particular attention to those relating to equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Signature of Dean:  

Date (d/m/y): _____/_____/

Provost Office Signature of Approval:  

Date (d/m/y): _____/_____/
